PRODUCTION NOTE

Adult Education, Literacy, and Libraries

DARLENE E. WEINGAND
Issue Editor

Library Trends

Fall 1986

Library Trends

(ISSN 0024-2594)

LIBRARY TRENDS, a quarterly journal of librarianship, provides a medium for evaluative recapitulation of current thought and practice, searching for those ideas and procedures which hold the greatest potentialities for the future.

Published four times a year, in summer, fall, winter, and spring. Office of publication: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. Second-class postage paid at Champaign, Illinois.

Subscription price is $30.00 a year (plus $2.50 postage for overseas subscribers). Individual issues are priced at $8.00. All foreign subscriptions and orders should be accompanied by payment. Address orders to Journals Department, University of Illinois Press, 54 E. Gregory Drive, Champaign, IL 61820. Editorial correspondence should be sent to Publications Office—*Library Trends*, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820.

Indexed in *Current Contents, Current Index to Journals in Education, Library and Information Science Abstracts, Library Literature, PAIS*, and *Social Sciences Citation Index*.

Postmaster: Send change of address to University of Illinois Press, 54 E. Gregory Dr., Champaign, Ill. 61820.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Library Trends

VOLUME 35 NUMBER 2

FALL 1986

University of Illinois
Graduate School of Library and Information Science

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

1. Title of publication: *Library Trends*. 2. Date of filing: 1 October 1986. 3. Frequency of issue: quarterly; no. of issues published annually: four; annual subscription price: $30 ($32.50 foreign) 4. Location of known office of publication: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. 6. Publisher: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Champaign, IL 61820; Editor: F.W. Lancaster, 410 David Kinley Hall, 1407 W. Gregory Dr., Urbana, IL 61801; Managing Editor: James S. Dowling, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. 7. Owner: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 249 Armory Bldg., 505 E. Armory St., Champaign, IL 61820. 8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: None. 9. The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of the organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during preceding 12 months.

10. Extent and nature of circulation	Average no. copies each issue during preceding 12 months	Actual no. copies of single issues puhlished nearest to filing date
A. Total no. copies printed	5016	5050
B. Paid circulation		
1. Sales through dealers (subscription agencies) and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	0	0
2. Mail Subscription (in addition to above)	3268	2691
C. Total Paid Circulation	3268	2691
D. Free distribution by mail, carrier or other means samples, complimentary, and other free copies	24	12
E. Total distribution	3292	2703
F. Copies not distributed		
1. Office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	1724	2347
2. Return from news agents	0	0
G. Total	5016	5050

Editor's Note: In volume 35, number 1 of the *Library Trends* issue on "Privacy, Secrecy, and National Information Policy," the article by M.E.L. Jacob and D.L. Rings inadvertantly had the copyright notice of Robert P. Bigelow omitted from the source information of table 1 on pages 122-23. The entry should have read:

Sources: Bigelow, Robert P. "Legal Protection of Computer Software." In *International Information Economy Handbook,* edited by G. Russell Pipe and Chris Brown. Springfield, Va.: Transnational Data Reporting Service, 1985, pp. 46-48 (chart is excerpted and updated from entire text). Update sources include: Authors' files; "International Software Protection," Fenwick, Davis, and West, 29 March 1985; Greguras, "International Software Protection," Practising Law Institute, June 1985; Borking, *Third Party Protection of Software and Firmware,* North Holland, 1985; Hanneman, *The Patentability of Computer Software,* Kluwer, 1985; Bernacchi and Deffense, "How to Protect Software in Venezuela," *Ten Selected Countries,* International Intellectual Property Alliance, Aug. 1985; Keplinger, *Copyright Aspects of the Protection of Computer Software,* WIPO, Dec. 1984; papers by D.S. Johnston, J.A. Connors, T.H. Lee, K.Y. Park, and S. Guo at the IBA Section on Business Law Conference, Singapore, Oct. 1985.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Adult Education, Literacy, and Libraries

DARLENE E. WEINGAND
Issue Editor

CONTENTS

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Introduction

DARLENE E. WEINGAND

THIS IS THE SECOND *Library Trends* issue focusing on adult education and libraries in recent years. The first issue, published in spring 1983, centered around the theme of adult learners and learning. Since 1983, national attention has been drawn increasingly to the growing problems of illiteracy in the United States. As a natural by-product, the relationship of libraries to literacy has become a topic of nationwide concern and federal, state, and local dollars have been directed toward strengthening library involvement with literacy projects all across this land.

In a time of rapid sociological and technological change—coupled with what has been termed the emergence of the Information Age, in which the volume of information available to each citizen seems to grow in geometric proportions—the importance of ready access to necessary data becomes paramount. However, equally critical is the ability to utilize these data once they are obtained and literacy (here defined as the ability to relate to and interact successfully with print, visual, and audio media) holds the key to this utilization.

This *Library Trends* issue on "Adult Education, Literacy, and Libraries" covers the broad spectrum of the topic. Beginning and ending with philosophical and theoretical approaches to the theme, this issue also looks at historical development, funding efforts, clientele, and specific library literacy projects. It is hoped that this slice from the many and varied literacy efforts that are occurring today and everyday in the

Darlene E. Weingand is Associate Professor, Communication Programs, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

context of library service will help to strengthen library involvement in participating libraries and inspire future involvement in others. The problems are real; the importance of libraries on the national literacy scene cannot be emphasized too strongly. This issue is dedicated to participating libraries everywhere.

Prologue: The Library-Learner Dynamic in a Changing World

The opening article sets the stage for the issue by examining the library-learner dynamic within the milieu of change. Darlene E. Weingand defines literacy in the broadest sense, covering the totality of information-carrying media, and relates that definition to educational design. She places the library within the overall structure of the national educational system and the consequent sharing of responsibility and cooperative efforts that would result. Moving from an organizational perspective to that of the individual learner, she discusses the attributes of the adult and the related stages of life development. The article concludes with a look at the public library response to the library-learner dynamic, emphasizing the role of the library as a support system to adults caught in the midst of a changing world.

Perspectives on Libraries and Literacy

The relationship between libraries and literacy can be viewed from a number of perspectives. Margaret E. Monroe examines the evolution of literacy programs in the context of library adult education. With a historical approach, she traces the roots of public libraries in the concern for literacy as well as summarizing the developing definitions of what literacy encompasses. Her analysis provides an important bridge between what is known about library involvement with literacy over the decades and what is needed in terms of critical analysis and an expanded definition of literacy in order to use what is learned.

The involvement of the American Library Association (ALA) in adult and literacy education from the 1920s to the 1980s is outlined by Jean Coleman. From July 1924, when ALA appointed the Commission on the Library and Adult Education, to the present, the American Library Association has demonstrated a continuing commitment to the lifelong learning of the American adult.

Moving from the historical view to the current literacy picture, Anne J. Mathews, Adrienne Chute, and Carol A. Cameron provide a federal perspective of the past two decades to the present time. Beginning with a background on literacy under library research and develop-

ment (R&D) and Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title I, they summarize early and more recent literacy projects. Literacy materials and computer software for literacy programs are identified as two key areas for Title I funds since 1980. Detailed descriptions are given of one-to-one tutoring programs, community literacy programs, and technology programs. Current developments in service to special groups and statewide coalitions are also highlighted. In addition, specific attention is given to the needs in evaluation and research.

The responses from state libraries to literacy issues are examined by Gary E. Strong. Beginning with a summary of state initiatives, which were compiled as background for the Second National Conference on Urban Literacy in 1985, this article also reports the results of a 1985 survey of the chief officers of state library agencies and concludes with a case study of the California experience.

Returning to the national level, Christina Carr Young describes the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) Literacy Project which evolved from a beginning in 1979 with the recurring issue of literacy at state-level pre-White House Conferences on Library and Information Services. Building upon this interest, and research and development projects conducted by the military in the area of reading improvement, NCLIS embarked upon a search for technology which could be applied to literacy programs. Three technological approaches and two test sites were selected for the demonstration project which is described in detail.

A grassroots volunteer effort that has grown to national proportions, the Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA), is studied by Karen K. Gaughan. After an overview of the development of the LVA, she presents case studies of literacy projects in libraries in a cross-section of states and makes recommendations for continued and future library participation in the literacy effort.

Barbara A. Bliss, an instructor of learning disabled adults in the Madison (Wisconsin) Area Technical College, describes some of the characteristics of this client group and what research has provided in understanding their special needs. She proceeds to outline strategies for interaction between libraries and this potential user group, concluding with an original poem written by one of her students.

Another link between libraries and adults with special needs is described by Ann R. Gehlen. She builds upon the expanded notion of literacy as the skills needed to function effectively in society and relates information regarding the library's role in providing information and skills to help clients cope with the changing world of work. Using examples of actual libraries engaged in this service, she discusses library

involvement in providing career choice/change information, job-hunting skills, and career-development skills.

Debra Wilcox Johnson moves beyond description of existing and potential library literacy programs to the challenge of effective evaluation of these programs. Consideration of a theoretical base, criteria for evaluation, and evaluation models lead into the outline of a proposed evaluation model. She describes an eight-step model that can be adapted to evaluation of individual literacy programs.

Epilogue: The Meaning of the Adult Independent Learning Project

This issue began with the broad scope of the library-learning dynamic. Subsequent articles moved from this general beginning to the detail of specific programs and projects. It is only fitting, then, that the issue conclude with a return to the broader view of the adult independent learner in which literacy is a vital but component part.

David Carr examines the Adult Independent Learning Project of the 1970s from the perspective of librarian involvement as mediator of information and instrument of the learner. He describes the independent learner's world and the learner's initiatives and ascribes a set of meanings to the original Adult Independent Learning Project. Concluding with learning and literacy in the public space, he proposes the necessity for a "shift in the librarian's gaze."

This is an issue of contrasts: of general and specific, of historical and present time, of analysis and proposal, of looking inward and outward. It is an issue that seeks to link past successes and less fruitful attempts that tried with the hopes and recommendations for a brighter future. It is this editor's dream that libraries will become focal points and nerve centers for information and education in their communities—for all the citizens, regardless of individual differences. The challenge for tomorrow is upon us, and it is worth the striving.

The Library-Learner Dynamic in a Changing World

DARLENE E. WEINGAND

MUCH HAS BEEN WRITTEN concerning the rate of change, the movement of society from an industrial era into an information age, and the rather startling advances in technological development. The focus of these voyages into literary expression has been primarily global in approach and less attention has been drawn to individual response to external change. Still fewer are the references to the public library's role vis-à-vis its community and client groups. The literature reflects much on automation and technology but generally from an operational perspective. This article will address this perceived gap and center on the library-learner dynamic as it is influenced by a changing world.

Today's World...Tomorrow's Challenge

The reality of today is the reality of change. Few people are unaware that things are changing, but the rate of that change—the acceleration that drives today's changes—is less apparent. As individuals conduct their daily lives, their attention is understandably concentrated on the details of living, and developments in the laboratory seem extremely remote. Occasional references to changes in the workplace, to new types of computers, or to new models of stereo equipment or televisions appear in local newspapers, but the overwhelming needs of everyday life keep such information at a psychological distance.

Darlene E. Weingand is Associate Professor, Communication Programs, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

However, the winds of change are so pervasive that there is no aspect of life that is not affected by the combination of social and technological forces, and it is unrealistic to adopt an ostrich-like stance, ignoring the certain reality of both change and its acceleration pattern. In an attempt to establish a bridge between present and future, Monroe states that the future's groundwork is laid by the past and by the forces at work upon society and public libraries in the present. Further, she asserts that:

> Futurists make no pretense at predicting the future; prophecy is for prophets. Realistically, our interest in the future lies in being able to influence it, not to predict it; to foresee alternatives, and to choose strategies that will give our preferred future a chance to develop. The future provides an opportunity for us to create, once we recognize the strategies needed to influence what happens. For it is obvious analysis alone does not influence the future; it is only as we use the insights gained, in analysis of the forces-at-work, and the preferred future we envision, to devise and carry out strategies of professional action that we can hope to influence the future.[1]

If libraries and librarians are to help their clients to prepare for a productive life in a changing world, there is a responsibility factor in Monroe's statement that must be acknowledged. All citizens have a real and fundamental need for coping skills and strategies for influencing their respective futures—a need which is present even in times of minimal change. This need becomes linked to other essential human needs at a very basic level during times of stress, and adapting successfully to change is indeed a time of significant stress.

Coping strategies are required for not only daily living in general but for occupational skills in particular. Occupational obsolescence is an observable and dramatic outcome of a time of swift change, and continuing education and self-development become integral components of career activity. The challenge is to both individuals and potential support systems to create viable mechanisms by which education can mitigate the consequences of incipient obsolescence. The opportunity for public library intervention on behalf of the citizens is unparalleled; the corresponding reward to the library of becoming part of the community mainstream is equally valuable.

Libraries, Learners, and Literacy

Learning takes place both formally and informally, and both approaches can be relevant to the public library mission. Beyond pure experience, however, a basic level of literacy is required in order to

provide a connection between the learner and the information which is to be learned.

Traditionally, literacy has been viewed in diverse ways. In earlier centuries, to be considered a truly literate individual may have required a knowledge of Greek and/or Latin, as well as the native language. In recent years, literacy has been interpreted as a basic knowledge of reading and writing one's native language to a level at which fundamental skills (such as completing forms) could be accomplished.

The *American Heritage Dictionary* defines *literacy* as "the condition or quality of being literate, especially the ability to read and write." The word *literate* is further defined as: "*adj.*(1) Able to read and write; (2) Knowledgeable; educated; (3) Familiar with literature; literacy; and (4) Well-written, polished, a literate essay—*n.*(1) Someone who can read and write and (2) A well-informed, educated person."

Both historically and, correspondingly, through dictionary definition, literacy has been viewed as print-related. This connection has been further extended today with the concept of computer literacy and the need to acquire a basic familiarity with computer hardware and software—a fundamentally print-oriented process. The relationship between the concept of literacy and the ability to interact successfully with print is readily understood by the education and library communities, and increasing attention is being directed toward public library involvement with literacy efforts.

The reality of today's world that must acknowledge and creatively use accelerating change also dictates that the definition of literacy be broadened. To be truly literate, today's citizen must not only relate to the print media but also to visual and audio media. There are now generations of individuals whose formative years have had significant exposure to radio and television. In addition, computer literacy—as an extension of print literacy—is increasingly cited as being necessary for occupational competence.

Consequently, it follows that literacy efforts should address the broader definition of literacy. Whether the public library is a direct or an indirect partner in the literacy effort, one of the library's services should center around providing access to a wide range of information formats. Programmatic activities encouraging critical analysis could supplement this access function.

Educating for Literacy

If this broadened definition of literacy is accepted as a given, then educational design needs to be reconfigured in order to reflect this

conceptual shift. The audience to be reached would now include not only those with low reading skills, but also the learning disabled and persons who are media-rich but literacy-poor. Whereas English classes have routinely taught strategies for comprehending the main points of sentences, paragraphs, and literary genres, few schools have devoted attention in any depth to critical television watching or critical listening. The skills of critical analysis of the various media need to be an integral part of the educational effort if citizens are to make truly effective use of their learning and informational opportunities.

In addition, Knowles states that:

> In an era of knowledge explosion, technological revolution, and a social policy of equality of educational opportunity, [the] definition of the purpose of education and...faith in the power of transmitted knowledge are no longer appropriate....In the world of the future we must define the mission of education as to produce *competent* people—people who are able to apply their knowledge under changing conditions; and...that the foundational competence all people must have is the competence to engage in lifelong self-directed learning.[2]

Since a significant number of citizens no longer have personal contact with formal classes, there is an opportunity gap to be filled in terms of helping people acquire the skills and competencies necessary for critical analysis of the print, audio, and visual media. Public libraries are in a unique position to use this opportunity to great advantage. Programming addressed to media literacy (including computer literacy) would meet client needs, create visibility for the library and its services, and create a more educated user of library materials.

If the public library were to assume this responsibility, it would be placed in the position of sharing the overall responsibility for literacy with the public educational system. While this could be a frustrating exercise in bureaucratic give-and-take, it could also produce a defined cooperative structure that could be extended to the K-12 configuration as well. An ultimate scenario could be written in which the public library achieves the long overdue recognition from funders and taxpayers—i.e., that the public library's mission is to serve the public from cradle to grave as a basic educational and informational resource and, in that capacity, the library deserves a share of the funding pie commensurate with that role.

Literacy and the Adult

The principles of adult development and adult learning need to be brought to bear upon the interaction of the library and the learner. These principles remain the same whether or not the adult's literacy skills have developed to a high level. For the purposes of this discussion, these principles are categorized in three groups:

1. *Knowles's concept of andragogy differentiates between the art and science of teaching adults (andragogy) and teaching children (pedagogy).* He emphasizes several key points:

a. It is a normal aspect of the process of maturation for a person to move from dependency toward increasing self-directedness, but at different rates for different people and in different dimensions of life.
b. As people grow and develop they accumulate a reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning...[and] attach more meaning to learnings they gain from experience than those they acquire passively.
c. People become ready to learn something when they experience a need to learn it in order to cope more satisfyingly with real-life tasks or problems.
d. Learners see education as a process of developing increased competence to achieve their full potential in life.[3]

In other words, the adult, in order to meaningfully engage in a learning experience designed to upgrade literacy skills, needs to work within a process that builds upon past experience, is problem- or task-oriented, and becomes increasingly self-directed. When these elements are omitted from the educational design, the probability of effective learning taking place may decrease.

2. *In addition, each individual should be considered within the context of the whole life span, the changes in role that the living environment creates.* The self is never isolated; rather, it is found in various social roles and sets of responsibilities. Just a few of the "hats" worn in a lifetime include becoming a self, child, sibling, parent, aunt or uncle, friend, citizen, learner, family member, worker, and leisure-time user. In the midst of all these relationships, the adult struggles to become both literate and competent. When physiological or psychological problems intervene, the resultant stress can render a self immobilized to a lesser or greater extent.

3. *The physical, cultural, and emotional aspects of time are of great consequence.* The child lives not only in the present but in the

future, and time seems endless. Adults have more stable interests and are able to internalize long-range goals and work toward them over a period of time. However, many adults (as well as children) live in the here-and-now and will seldom work toward distant goals unless they have a commitment to these goals. To the old, the time that is left may appear very short and to be valued—even hoarded, rather than spent. Therefore, for an adult more than for a child the investment of time in an activity may be as important a decision as the investment of effort or money.[4]

4. *The stages of life provide additional clues to understanding adult learners.* Robinson has synthesized the research of Sheehy, Gould, Levinson, Neugarten, and others into the following outline of adult stage theories:[5]

a. *Early Adulthood*...the issue of intimacy (relating to other people) *vs.* isolation.
   1. *Ages 18-22*....Pulling up roots; leaving family; continuing educational preparation; beginning work; handling peer relationships; managing time and money.
   2. *Ages 22-28*....Becoming adult; establishing autonomy; finding a mentor; setting in motion life patterns (mate selection, home ownership, parenthood).
   3. *Ages 28-33*....An age 30 transition time when youthful dreams come to grips with reality; concerns about being too narrow and restricted in life choices; also characterized by a new vitality; often a time of change, turmoil and dissatisfaction; time of reappraisal, searching for personal values.
b. *Middle Adulthood*...the issue of generativity (a commitment to and caring for the next generation and one's career) *vs.* stagnation.
   1. *Middle age (35-60)*....most powerful stage in life in terms of earning capacity, influence on people, impact on society.
   2. *Ages 33-38*....Becoming one's own person; establishing one's niche in society; developing competence; reaching out; relating to family, children, friends; conflicting time demands.
   3. *Ages 38-46*....Midlife transition; an unstable time; awareness that time is running out; reassessment of marriage, work; search for meaning; relating to teen-age children and aging parents; reversal between men and women vis-à-vis aggressive work-related and nurturing roles; vulnerability.
   4. *Ages 46-53*....Settling down; formation of new life structure; discovery of ultimate aloneness and personal responsibility for one's life; may be major age 50 transition.
   5. *Ages 53-60*....Renewal or resignation; time of increased personal satisfaction; development of secondary interests in preparation for later years.
c. *Later Adulthood*...issue of integrity (belief that one's life has had a purpose) *vs.* despair.
   1. *Ages 60-65*...retirement or anticipation/dread of retirement; especially difficult for those who defined selves by their careers; adjustments to less income; confrontation by loss (of job, home, spouse); expanded avocational interests.

2. *Ages 65 and up*...phases of retirement (anticipation, euphoria, disenchantment, reorientation, stability); educationally active; have greater zest for living and self-concept; religious beliefs increase; search for meaning of life; reviewing one's life; increased dependence; involvement in the dying process.

These stages illustrate the range of possible adult behaviors and potential at various points in life. It is but a small step to the realization of how these stages would impact adult learning and receptivity to learning.

The stages of adult development can be compared to a series of rapidly taken snapshots. The subject of each photo is the same, but the image varies to a greater or lesser degree—and each snapshot is unique. As a person moves through the life span, personal and environmental conditions change and force changes within the individual. It would be inappropriate to view adults as a homogeneous mass of learners; it is equally inappropriate to view a single adult as a homogeneous personality. Each person is an eclectic series of selfs or identities—of snapshots—from birth until death. Further, each person has an individual learning style which responds on a very personal basis to different types of media: some persons learn best through reading print; others interact more positively with audio and/or visual media. When the stresses and pressures of life's stages, of environmental changes, and of personal learning styles are combined, the individuality of the learning process becomes even more pronounced.

The Public Library Response

How, then, can a positive library-learner dynamic be created in this changing world? Knox states that when a change event occurs, the need for some adaptation produces—for some adults at least—a heightened readiness to engage in educative activity. The resulting educative activity may be directly or indirectly related to the change event, and the relation may or may not be recognized by the individual. This period of heightened readiness has been referred to as a teachable moment. The educative activity may include all types of informal information seeking such as reading and talking with others as well as more formal participation in part-time externally sponsored educational programs.[6]

Since libraries are staffed by adults who are caught in the midst of the whirlwind of change both personally and professionally—and also serve adults who are buffeted by the same wind—the opportunities to engage in "teachable moments" can be found on both sides of the reference desk. The vast resources to be found in libraries can be an

impetus to the continuing professional development of staff and to the lifelong learning of the library's users.

From the beginning, libraries have been struggling with setting priorities within the multiple missions of information, education, recreation, and cultural enhancement. The rate of societal and technological change is demanding an increased emphasis on the educational role of libraries, both as complementary to formal education and as the natural home for nontraditional learning. As a neutral, nonthreatening environment for learning, libraries have already created an optimum condition in which learning may take place. Further positive aspects of the library-learner dynamic should be based on collection building which specifically addresses learner needs and programmatic activities designed to facilitate the learning process.

Collections for learners...how are they different? It is hoped that every library seeks to build collections of materials which relate to the requests of their clientele. However, as stated earlier in the discussion on literacy, collections must contain materials in a wide variety of formats—formats that will be in tune with the learning styles of the library users. For libraries which have been print-dominant to the extent that audiovisual materials are considered a supplement or a luxury, a major attitudinal shift is required. It would not be unreasonable to expect an equitable distribution of materials across the range of formats so that information access is truly available to all.

In addition, collections would include self-study materials (in print, audio, computer, and visual formats, of course) and information on educational opportunities to be found locally through both formal and informal sources. College and technical school catalogs would be available as would listings of possible tutors and individuals seeking to study in groups. Postings would be made of educational and cultural events.

Programmatic activities...would build upon the collection resources in such programs as tutoring (i.e., in reading, a subject discipline, a skill), lectures, and discussion groups. Librarians would serve as learners' advisers, counseling independent learners along their progression toward learning goals, and providing referral to other agencies when appropriate. Support groups for learners would be encouraged. The creative imagination can invent numerous activities that would foster the learning experience.

Specific library responses will vary from community to community. Today's library does—and yet does not—resemble the familiar library of yesterday. While acknowledging and building upon its tradition and heritage, the library is moving assertively into a technological

future that offers the potential for ever more effective resources for learners. Lagging behind these new realities of service, however, are the marketing strategies and expertise that would communicate what is both actual and possible to a frustrated citizenry. The critical key is that the focus be on the learner's or client's need. It is vital that some of the teachable moments for librarians include a heightened awareness of the importance of acquiring the requisite marketing and communication skills that would form the linkages to learners and their needs.

The public library has a unique opportunity today in the history and progression of humankind to forge these linkages and become the support system that will help individuals ride the crest of change to positive and rewarding outcomes. It is a new imperative for public library service.

References

1. Monroe, Margaret E. "The Future for Public Library Adult Services: Opportunities and New Directions." In *Public Libraries and New Directions for Adult Services,* edited by Joan C. Durrance and Rose Vainstein, p. 59. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, School of Library Science, 1981.

2. Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy,* rev. ed. Chicago: Follett, 1980, pp. 18-19.

3. Ibid., pp. 43-44.

4. Kidd, James R. *How Adults Learn,* rev. ed. New York: Association Press, 1973, p. 48.

5. Robinson, Russell D. *An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change.* Milwaukee, Wis.: Bible Study Press, 1979, pp. 16-19.

6. Knox, Alan B. *Adult Development and Learning: A Handbook on Individual Growth and Competence in the Adult Years for Education and the Helping Professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977, p. 539.

Additional References

Birge, Lynn E. *Serving Adult Learners: A Public Library Tradition.* Chicago: ALA, 1981.

Commission on Non-Traditional Study, and Gould, Samuel B. *Diversity by Design.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Conroy, Barbara. "Continuing Education in Libraries: A Challenge to Change Agents." *New Directions for Continuing Education* 9(1981):81-88.

Gleason, Gerald T., ed. *The Theory and Nature of Independent Learning.* Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1967.

Heffernan, James M., et al. *Educational Brokering: A New Service for Adult Learners.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Brokering, 1976.

Mavor, Anne S., et al. "An Overview of the National Adult Independent Learning Project." *RQ* 15(Summer 1976):293-308.

Varlejs, Jana, ed. *Communication/Information/Libraries: A New Alliance.* Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1985.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, and Stephens, John. *Libraries and Our Civilization: A Report Prepared for the Governor of the State of New York*. [Albany], N.Y.: Governor's Conference on Libraries, 1978.

The Evolution of Literacy Programs in the Context of Library Adult Education

MARGARET E. MONROE

IT IS NOT SURPRISING that adult literacy has emerged and reemerged cyclically as an element in public library philosophy and adult services. Democratization of our political society and evolution of our economic society from emphasis on skilled crafts to industrial mechanization to high technology have put a premium on the adult's capacity to read. While public schools from the early nineteenth century were focused on the three basic literacy skills of "reading, writing, and 'rithmetic," a significant proportion of our adult population arrived in mainstream American society either without English language skills or without capacity for the three Rs in any language. Waves of immigration from overseas throughout U.S. history and, increasingly in this century, from ill-schooled rural and urban areas of the United States have evoked response from urban public libraries.

What is the rationale for the public library's involvement in literacy programs? Basically, the public library has a responsibility to maintain the climate for use of the library's resources; a literate society is essential to its continued use. As Ranganathan has made clear, libraries have a responsibility to their resources to see that they are used by people who need them.

Roots of Public Libraries in the Concern for Literacy

In the much embattled field of the history of public libraries in the last decade or two, no one has sought to claim a motivation of the young

Margaret E. Monroe is Professor Emerita, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

institution to be that of providing basic literacy skills. Users were assumed to be able to read, and those who were not literate were outside the scope of the library's concern. Literacy was the context within which the public library functioned. Jesse Shera, in *Foundations of the Public Library*, wrote:

> In [the appeal to the popular mind] the public library [of the mid-nineteenth century] was favored by a spirit developing in New England, as elsewhere in America. There was a widespread conviction that universal literacy was necessary, and there was much enthusiasm for education for its own sake. Many believed in the possibility of self-education and the practical value of vocational and technical studies. Finally, there was a prevalent assumption that reading promotes morality. From these convictions there emerged a popular awareness of the importance of the public library to the people.[1]

The library's role was beyond the basic capacity to make out the words on the page. Benjamin Franklin's assessment of the influence of the Library Company of Philadelphia, as cited by Shera, was tied to the library's influence on the informed thinking of society: "the [North American subscription] libraries have improved the general conversation of the Americans, made common tradesmen and farmers as intelligent as most gentlemen from other countries."[2]

Literacy at the level of intellectual curiosity and the power to grasp the significance of meanings leading to the desire to gain and use knowledge was linked by Shera to public-library development. He quoted a foreign visitor in 1853: "Bostonians are a reading public," and he observed that this determination to acquire knowledge was carried to such a pitch "that the coachman who drives you to hear a lecture will pay his money to go in and attend its delivery."[3]

As George Ticknor underscored in his famous 1842 Boston Public Library Report, the public library was to pick up its educational task from the point that the public schools left off. We are justified in concluding that the role of the public library in the early years carried a concern for a higher level of literacy than that of basic literacy.

By the 1850s, Sidney Ditzion concluded that the public library movement was a major force and had swept a wide variety of philosophies and purposes into its forward progress.

> On the whole, the needs of the urban wage-earner and his children seem to have been the focus of ideas expressed in behalf of free public libraries. The humanitarian emphasized uplift for the underprivileged. The educator wished to extend downward the benefits of learning beyond the limits already achieved. The democrat desired an informed populace for wider political participation. The common man was interested in his own advancement. The conservative saw in

> such educational facilities more favorable auspices for a stable society....Both the institution and its methods were conceived...as a contribution toward the self-realization of the broad masses of the people.[4]

Basic literacy was assumed as a prerequisite to public-library use, but the spread of knowledge, understanding, and vocational and civic skills was seen as linked to the outcome of the use of libraries.

In interpreting the role of the public library at the turn of the last century, Rosemary Dumont quotes Henry Steele Commager: "The decade of the 1890s is the watershed of American history,"[5] with its move into the predominantly industrial, urban society of "modern" America. Dumont sees the early roots and goals of the public library yielding to new social forces. Extensive cultural adjustments required by the influx of uprooted rural Americans and European immigrants caused turmoil in the cities. Government was mobilized as an agency of human welfare as social reforms swept the cities. Public libraries intensified their role as a social escalator for the deprived, providing literacy, acculturation, and employment skills. Lowell A. Martin commented on this period: "The family and school were no longer sufficient to mold a unified society, as in late 19th century America, with large groups of immigrants entering the country. The democratization of knowledge attending the rise of the common man was one of the contexts within which the public library grew."[6]

Work with the foreign born in the New York Public Library and similar large urban libraries across the country began about 1900 and initiated the first programs of basic literacy in public libraries. Branch library programs had a wide scope. Monroe reported:

> While the emphasis varied in work among different national groups, there was a similarity of program among the branch libraries serving concentrations of foreign population: viewing the branch library as a neighborhood cultural center; sponsoring classes in English for adults; introducing adult school classes to the library; presenting lectures, concerts, and art exhibits related to the national cultures of the neighborhood groups; involving neighborhood leaders in sponsorship of library events; sustaining a book collection in the native languages of the neighborhood groups; staffing the library with a professional librarian competent in the native languages of the local groups and sympathetic to their cultural values.[7]

One foreign assistant made clear the subtlety with which literacy "instruction" was introduced through her weekly Mothers' Club: "I tried to devote one part of the meeting to reading and discussion of an article on [hygiene, child study, or current events], the other to the reading of a story."[8] Specific "classes in English" were sponsored rather

than conducted by the public librarians on the whole. The selection of "readable books" for literate and illiterate foreigners and American-born readers of limited reading ability was a common focus among public libraries in the 1930s and 1940s and represents an extension of "literacy" services although it was seldom interpreted as such.

Defining Literacy

The term *literacy* refers to "the ability to read and write," according to Webster's various dictionaries. Library literacy programs have focused on reading. The expansion of literacy to include understanding, critical analysis, and ability to grasp knowledge from print and to put it to use has evolved over the years.

With the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, there was an expansion of the meaning of basic literacy from a single focus on reading to include reading, writing, and simple calculation. The earlier test of basic literacy (the ability to write one's name) then expanded to the abilities gained in primary grades. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 enabled programs of adult basic education (ABE) to become widely available through public schools. The definition of literacy expanded to show two levels: basic literacy and functional literacy, which represented skills for coping with daily living.

At this point the question was raised: What is the public library's role in literacy education? Professional response to this was embodied in the refocus of libraries away from "literacy" to "services to adult illiterates," the focus used by Bernice MacDonald in her report *Literacy Activities in Public Libraries* in 1966.[9]

During the 1960s, public librarians focused on identifying or stimulating development of reading materials for illiterate and new literate groups, and on joint planning and programming with other educational agencies. But reading aloud adult groups; adult school class visits to learn skills in library use; informational materials on home, jobs, and job-finding; as well as book talks to stimulate interest in applying the new reading skills expanded the program of materials provision to teachers and classes.

MacDonald identified the question "Is it the library's job to teach?" and concluded that the debate was probably won by those who said: It is the library's job to see that the teaching gets done[10] and that the library is ready to supply materials and space for classes, recruit students, and follow up with reading guidance and information service to the adult new literates.

For the decade following the MacDonald Report, new and innovative programs—both in and outside libraries—emphasized the excitement of reading when it is related to the keen interests of the nonreader.[11]

An extensive study in depth of the relationship of illiterates and new literates to print, conducted by Helen H. Lyman at the University of Wisconsin—Madison over almost a ten-year-period, brought a series of professional reports, two of which have shaped the thinking of the profession about literacy.[12] In 1976 and 1977 Lyman freshly defined literacy as characterized by four developmental stages, moving from (1) *illiteracy* (unable to read or write) to (2) *basic literacy* or functional illiteracy (some words are recognized and meaning is extracted from them, but assistance from others who can read is needed for many daily functions at home or work) to (3) *functional literacy* or "limited literacy" (able to handle home, job, community tasks using print but not fully able to study new fields of knowledge) to (4) *mature reader* or "literacy" (able to understand virtually all materials the average citizen is expected to read plus materials within his or her special interests).[13]

Lyman further summarized the nature of skills needed for reading:

1. Visual discrimination among letters and words.
2. Auditory discrimination (hearing words distinctly and relating them to printed words).
3. Capacity for sustained attention.
4. A range of vocabulary and idiom.
5. Comprehension: understanding words and sentences; grasping details as well as main idea or general significance of a passage; grasp inferences or implications.
6. Fluency and efficiency in reading.
7. Capacity to handle special kinds of reading materials (maps, telephone books, dictionary, etc.).
8. Capacity to respond (critical reading, empathetic reading) for evaluation, appreciation, enjoyment.[14]

Further, Lyman perceived literacy as providing the power to the new literate to deal with the tasks of daily living, the expansion of horizons for life, and for self-realization. She pointed to Howard McClusky's model of the power/load concept with the perception that literacy can provide the "margin of power" to enable the new literate to handle the load of his responsibilities.[15] By the late 1970s, the definition of *literacy* has grown to include competent understanding and use of a range of printed materials and the capacity to put the new knowledge to use.

In the decades of the 1960s, 1970s, and into the 1980s, the expansion of media which store information, opinion, and creative experience has

been great. The capacity to use films, television, and computerized programmed texts may well represent the additional literacy skills needed in the 1980s and 1990s for the daily tasks at home, on the job, and in the community. Ella Griffin, then education program specialist, U.S. Office of Education, wrote a foreword to Lyman's *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries* and commented on a broader definition of literacy in dominantly illiterate societies:

> Libraries have become more education-oriented, utilizing a wide range of communications media. This is especially important in areas where the great majority of the people are illiterate and where literacy education must begin and often continue indefinitely to operate at the pre-book level. In such regions, literacy is still not considered to be the first stage in the process of education, and the oral tradition still prevails. Audiovisual media make a natural bridge between customary and new ways of learning. Accordingly, library services are being developed which capitalize on this phenomenon, services which can respond flexibly to the varied and changing needs of an expanded readership.[16]

Public librarianship has yet to make the leap in literacy programs to include skills in obtaining information and messages from these media with understanding, with critical analysis, and with the capacity to use what is learned.

Issues in Current Adult Literacy Services

Tying the program of literacy services of public libraries to the institution's philosophical commitments raises two important issues. The first issue rests for its resolution on what we understand literacy to mean and the extent to which public libraries have an interest in sustaining a fully literate public. Ralph Beals, in a 1943 memo to his supervisor of branches in the New York Public Library, commented that the major role of the public library in adult education was "infusing authentic knowledge into the thinking and decision-making of the community."[17] The American Library Association Council in 1984 provided a rationale for the association's "Four Year Goals" "in an atomic age," declaring that libraries "must now put major emphasis on spreading information and stimulating citizen action upon the solution of problems." Merely having collections and services related to the problems was no longer sufficient, but library services should directly contribute to citizen action.[18] Lyman's analysis of the mature reader in 1976 included the capacity for "independent critical thinking."[19]

Are these matters of literacy? Mortimer J. Adler and Charles Van Doren, in their college manual *How to Read a Book,* identify four levels of reading:

> *Elementary Reading*—"beginning literacy": recognize the words on the page and have the capacity to answer the question "What does the sentence say?" Only after answering this question can one proceed to try to understand.
> *Inspectional Reading*—the art of "skimming systematically," of getting the most out of a book in a relatively short time, in order to understand the topic, structure, and point of view of the book.
> *Analytical Reading*—"the best and most complete reading that is possible given an unlimited time" and concentrates on understanding. This is "intensely active reading," testing and criticizing the book.
> *Syntopical Reading*—reading a number of books on a topic comparatively, "placing them in relation to one another and to the subject." The syntopical reader "is able to construct an analysis of the subject that may not be in any of the books."[20]

Literacy has traditionally been related to level one, yet true literacy (in Francis Bacon's terminology) requires special skills at levels two, three, and four. Reading is not just deciphering the words, but includes ingesting the meaning and testing its validity as well as responding by putting what is learned to use.

Public librarians, under the adult education movement, have had an instinct for their responsibility to enable reading at level three (analytical reading) as they have sponsored book discussion programs for over fifty years. The skills of reading complex ideas and reading about complicated human experiences have been the focus of discussion programs from the late 1920s, with the People's Institute; through Great Books, American Heritage, and the diverse programs of the 1950s and 1960s to the present the "Let's Talk About It" series. These programs may well be conceived of as a part of a broad literacy program.

A second issue revolves around the question of whether literacy has to do only with print. As the technology for delivery of information, opinion, and human experience has expanded beyond print and the stained-glass window to include such media as films, television, and computerized programmed texts, the need to master new skills in analysis and criticism of these forms of message is urgent. Much uncritical use of film (to pass the time, to trigger conversation, etc.) needs to be supplemented by critical use of film. Television's mock-up of reality is very persuasive, but sophisticated viewers are able to analyze bias in the camera work and distortion of facts and impressions by the selection or sequencing of topics or the editing of the record. The field known in the

late 1930s as "propaganda analysis" and designed for the layman needs now to be drawn from the corridors of research in the advertising and political party fields so that, in full public view, the layman may be a good critical judge of what he sees.

Equally important for laymen's understanding are the limits and problems posed by programmed texts—the computerizing of which does nothing to remove. As reading is supplemented by these media as sources of knowledge and bases for action, public librarians might appropriately assist in the sophisticating of their users.

The exercise of intellectual freedom, which so often stresses freedom from interference in access to resources, might focus equally on the freedom to make informed judgments. The cause of intellectual freedom may best be served by professional concern for the promotion of skills in informed decision-making. Public library services, when analyzed for their contribution to use of a wide range of resources for arriving at opinions and decision, may prove to have established a considerable program of "literacy for the mature literate."

References

1. Shera, Jesse H. *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England 1629-1855.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949, p. 217.

2. Ibid., p. 32. As quoted in Franklin, Benjamin. *Autobiography.* New York: Random House, 1932, pp. 75-76.

3. Ibid., p. 119. As quoted in Bunn, Alfred. *Old England and New England.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Hart, 1853, pp. 22, 29.

4. Ditzion, Sidney H. *Arsenals of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Public Library Movement in New England and the Middle States from 1850-1900.* Chicago: ALA, 1947, p. 193.

5. Dumont, Rosemary Ruhig. *Reform and Reaction: The Big City Public Library in American Life.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977, p. 31. As quoted in Commager, Henry Steele. *The American Mind.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965, p. 41.

6. Martin, Lowell A. "The American Public Library as a Social Institution." *Library Quarterly* 7(Oct. 1937):556.

7. Monroe, Margaret E. *Library Adult Education: The Biography of an Idea.* New York: Scarecrow, 1963, p. 280.

8. Ibid., p. 281.

9. MacDonald, Bernice. *Literacy Activities in Public Libraries: A Report of a Study of Services to Adult Illiterates.* Chicago: ALA, 1966.

10. Ibid., p. 35.

11. Fader, Daniel N., and Shaevitz, Morton H. *Hooked on Books.* New York: Berkeley Publishing, 1966.

12. Lyman, Helen Huguenor. *Reading and the Adult New Reader.* Chicago: ALA, 1976; and _____ . *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries.* Chicago: ALA, 1977.

13. _____ . *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries,* p. 15.

14. Ibid., pp. 119-24.
15. Ibid., p. 68.
16. Ibid., p. x.
17. Monroe, *Library Adult Education,* p. 370.
18. American Library Association Council. "Four Year Goals" (statement of policy adopted by Council, 31 Jan. 1948). *ALA Bulletin* 42(March 1948):121.
19. Lyman, *Reading and the Adult New Reader,* p. 19.
20. Adler, Mortimer J., and Van Doren, Charles. *How to Read a Book,* rev. ed. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972, pp. 16-20.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

ALA's Role in Adult and Literacy Education

JEAN ELLEN COLEMAN

Introduction

THE GROWTH OF LITERACY education programs in libraries in the 1970s and 1980s is not an isolated phenomenon in the field of librarianship. The role of public libraries in the continuing education and lifelong learning of the out-of-school adult was discussed in America as early as the 1830s.[1] Current literacy education programs take the library's role in the community beyond being a center for book collections to serve the independent learner toward being a local alternative education center actively involved in building the learner's reading skills. It provides an expansive role for the librarian in developing users of books. Librarians are educators—not merely in the sense of being instructors but in the broader view of being facilitators for learning.

ALA Activity in Adult Education

According to Grace Stevenson, former ALA associate executive secretary, "the Association's purpose has always been to increase the use and usefulness of books....The ALA has been responsible for several projects of some consequence which are directly related to the stimulation and improvement of reading."[2] A brief review of ALA's activities over the years between the 1920s and the 1980s demonstrates an evolution of interest in the library's role in adult education projects to its present support of the development of library literacy programs.

Jean Ellen Coleman is Director, ALA Office for Library Outreach Services, Coalition for Literacy, Chicago, Illinois.

In July 1924, the ALA appointed a commission on the library and adult education whose work was funded by the Carnegie Foundation. The commission, chaired by Judson T. Jennings, ALA's past-president, was charged "to study the adult education movement, and the work of libraries for adults and for older boys and girls out of school, and to report its findings and recommendations to the ALA Council."[3] In its report published in 1924, the commission defined adult education with concepts that are relevant in the 1980s:

> What is Adult Education? It may mean the teaching of reading to illiterates. To some, it means the Americanization of the foreign-born; to others, it signifies vocational training. But Adult Education goes far beyond all these. It is based on a recognition of the fact that education is a life-long process, and that the university graduate, as well as the man of little schooling, is in need of further training, inspiration, and mental growth; that the training secured in school and college is necessarily limited to fundamentals, and that the real development of the individual lies in the independent effort of later years.[4]

At the conclusion of its two-year survey of public library activities the commission published a formal report. In the report they made six recommendations and cited "nine definite needs that require serious consideration" for libraries to meet their responsibilities in adult education. Among the needs cited were: (1) "a direct service of advice and assistance to individual readers and students"; (2) "an information service regarding local opportunities for adult education"; and (3) "organized and more adequate library service to other organizations engaged in adult education...." The commission recommended that the ALA "establish a permanent 'Adult Education Board' to continue [their] studies." The commission also recommended the continuation of the ALA "Reading With A Purpose" project of reading lists launched in 1925.[5] "These were carefully chosen well-annotated subject lists with an introductory essay by an expert in the field. The lists covered sixty-seven subjects when publication was discontinued in 1933, at which time approximately 850,000 copies had been sold."[6]

The commission was dissolved in 1926 but the ALA Council created the Board on Library and Adult Education (1926-1937) and later the ALA Education Board (1937-1955). The primary work of the latter board was "securing foundation funds for experimentation, initiating projects to increase the educational effectiveness of libraries, and encouraging librarians to put more emphasis on serving the educational needs of the individual reader....The adult educational services provided by public libraries between 1920 and 1940 were directed toward three

main goals: personal development, vocational improvement, and civic enlightenment."[7]

These adult education activities within ALA and in the field were not accepted without controversy. Lynn E. Birge effectively describes the debate and opposition of many of the profession's outstanding leaders of their time as they viewed the role of the library in adult education.[8] Margaret E. Monroe insightfully concludes:

> There was almost no technique or condition of service which did not, at one time or another, receive the label "adult education"—from cataloging for the general reader to the placement of book collections in labor union head-quarters...increasingly within the American Library Association, "adult services" had become a category including the broad range of information and educational services to adults and proved a highly satisfactory term and context both for the librarians who were adult education minded and for those who were not. The development of "adult services" to cover the group of *services* freed "adult education" to function once again as a *philosophy* concerned with values and objectives for educational services.[9]

Assisting individuals and groups to use library book resources for personal education and enlightenment became well established in public libraries as the ALA maintained its involvement in both the philosophy and programs in adult education. Book talks, book clubs, exhibits, film programs, lectures, as well as reader's advisory services were being offered in public libraries. With grants received from the Fund for Adult Education, ALA launched a series of adult education projects from 1951 to 1955. Among them was a project to survey the varieties of adult education programs in public libraries. The findings were reported by Helen Lyman Smith on data collected from librarians' responses.[10] The questionnaire developed for the study included a list of thirty-seven services identified and defined as relating to adult education. An important observation revealed by the survey was that the planning of these library activities was based on internal decisions rather than on an analysis of community need as advocated by the ALA Adult Education Board.[11]

ALA and Literacy Education

After the work of the Adult Education Board, ALA established, at the 1957 Annual Conference, the Adult Services Division (ASD). The term *adult services* was broadly defined to include "indirect guidance services, reader guidance services, services to organizations, library-sponsored group programs, and services to the community."[12]

In response to a growing interest of librarians to serve illiterates, both the ALA Adult Services Division and the Public Library Association (PLA) developed two separate committees: the ASD Committee on Reading Improvement for Adults and the PLA Committee on Serving the Functionally Illiterate. It was the ASD committee, however, that in 1964 obtained a J. Morris Jones-World Book Encyclopedia-ALA Goals Committee grant to study public library service to the functionally illiterate. Bernice MacDonald of the New York Public Library was hired as principal investigator. The study included field trips to fifteen cities where literacy education programs were being conducted. MacDonald observed joint planning and programming between libraries and literacy agencies. The primary problem librarians faced was a lack of appropriate materials for the beginning adult reader.[13]

The fifteen librarians involved in literacy education programs were reflective of the library field's response to the social changes occurring within the United States. Librarians were cognizant of the events of the times which included the civil rights movement and the development of the "War on Poverty." The library field was being challenged by new social needs and legislative priorities to serve the "economically and culturally disadvantaged." The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) reflected the concerns of the "Great Society." The word *outreach* became a label for the process of extending library services and programs to nontraditional library users.

The concern and interest of some librarians in the late 1950s and 1960s gave rise to the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) and also, in 1969, to the ALA Coordinating Committee on Library Services to the Disadvantaged. After two years' work the committee recommended the development of an office to continue their efforts. In 1970 the ALA voted, at its annual conference, to establish an Office for Library Service to the Disadvantaged (OLSD). At the ALA annual conference in 1980, the council voted to change the name of the office to the Office for Library Outreach Services (OLOS). The OLSD advisory committee members requested a change to identify a process for reaching out to nontraditional library users rather than using the label ascribed to a specific population. The office was opened in September 1973 with the primary objective being "to ensure that all urban and rural poor have convenient access to library services that they recognize as meeting their needs." The program direction OLSD (and later OLOS) took was defined as: "(a) education, within libraries, for literacy and the maintenance of literacy skills; (b) the provision of life-centered 'survival' information and referral [services]; (c) promotion of library outreach services...."[14]

Literacy education is a significant and relevant method for reaching out to those individuals and groups often identified as "disadvantaged," "nonusers," or "underusers" of library services. Literacy education would provide the adult with a reason and a skill to use libraries. The terminology and definitions of adult functional illiteracy are discussed in most of the literature developed about the problem since the early 1900s. Briefly, adults are termed "functionally illiterate" when their skills of reading and comprehension are so limited that they cannot apply these skills to their everyday life. Reading labels, menus, applications, street signs, writing their names, and comprehending simple arithmetic problems or instructions are not within their capabilities. U.S. Department of Education studies in 1975 and recently confirm that one out of every five Americans is functionally illiterate.[15] Literacy education is that part of adult education in which the basic skills of reading, oral and written communication, and numeracy are taught.

On the heels of the library field's involvement with the U.S. Office of Education's Right to Read (R2R) project, ALA began to discuss the library's role in activities for those people identified as adult functional illiterates. OLSD (OLOS) and PLA obtained a grant from the Bureau of Library and Learning Resources, the U.S Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education to develop a handbook for librarians about their role in literacy activities. The project involved representatives from eight ALA units and experts from the fields of reading, adult education, and literacy volunteer groups. The book, *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries,* written by Helen H. Lyman, was well received by those librarians who wanted a guide to help them develop literacy programs. It was reviewed in the education press as well as in library journals.[16]

Lyman's book also became a focal point for the next program undertaken by OLSD (OLOS), which was to train a cadre of librarians who would act as trainers for other library staff members and trustees. OLSD (OLOS) obtained a large grant to conduct the training from the Lilly Endowment Inc. In 1979 a series of three workshops were conducted in Bloomington, Indiana; Denver, Colorado; and Syracuse, New York. One hundred and twenty-four participants from thirty-three states and the Virgin Islands attended the four-day workshops. The workshops were designed to train librarians in the techniques of establishing programs for tutoring in basic literacy skills for the functionally illiterate. The workshops had embedded within them an emphasis on identifying the community literacy needs and collaboration with other literacy provider agencies such as adult basic education programs or

literacy volunteer programs. The trainers involved in the program came from the fields of librarianship, adult education, the Literacy Volunteers of America, and the Laubach Literacy International. All expenses were paid for each participant from the Lilly Endowment grant. Participants came in teams of two. Each member of the team and their supervisor had to sign an agreement that the participant would return to their state, regional, or large metropolitan library to train others and/or to establish literacy education programs in their libraries. The results of the workshops were characterized as having a "ripple-effect." Over 862 additional librarians (or 6.95 others per ALA workshop participant) were trained and new programs sprung up around the country.

Additionally, grant funds enabled OLSD (OLOS) to develop a model collection of materials for adult new readers that librarians could review as a basis for starting collections in their libraries. Two sets of basic literacy materials were purchased for circulation through the ALA headquarters library. The materials were selected by Melissa Forinash Buckingham, Reader's Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia.

Workshops or ALA conference programs have been important in keeping a focus on library literacy activity. A post-conference workshop to bring together library literacy program administrators, library school faculty and trustees was held in Philadelphia following the 1982 ALA Annual Conference. The workshop was cosponsored by OLOS, the American Library Trustee Association (ALTA) and the Public Library Association (PLA). The workshop was underwritten in part by Scott Foresman's Lifelong Learning Division and the "Famous Amos" Cookie Co. (Wally Amos is the national spokesperson for Literacy Volunteers of America). In 1984 a preconference training workshop designed for public and state library staff and trustee members was presented in Denton, Texas. The workshop was again sponsored by OLOS, PLA, and ALTA. Both of these workshops also drew participants from the education and publishing professions.

Other units within the ALA also have developed strong committee interests in library literacy related activities.[17] The American Library Trustee Association has made a strong commitment to library literacy programs. They promote literacy programs in libraries through a variety of ways that include an award that is given to an individual who has been prominent in promoting literacy. The Public Library Association revamped their Right to Read Committee into a very active Alternative Education Programs Section (AEPS). They represent the interests of public librarians in a broad spectrum of adult and literacy education programs. PLA/AEPS has inaugurated an "Advancement of Literacy

Award" whose recipients are publishers or booksellers. The Young Adult Services Division (YASD) has a High Interest/Low Level Literacy Materials Evaluation Committee that publishes annotated selected lists.

Another significant structural advance for literacy and libraries was the affiliation by the ALA Council of two national literacy organizations: the Laubach Literacy International (LLI) and the Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. (LVA). Affiliation signifies a recognition of the "kindred purposes" of a national organization with the ALA.[18] The affiliation of these organizations was sponsored by OLOS with the approval of other ALA units. Both LLI (or its national "arm"—Laubach Literacy Action) and LVA have public-library-based literacy programs. Their representatives have been active in many ALA-sponsored training workshops, programs, and conferences.

The ALA took a giant leap into its commitment to literacy education in 1981 when it brought together eleven national volunteer, private, and public sector organizations to organize the Coalition for Literacy.[19] Each organization has a history of involvement in working to promote a more literate population. The ALA Office for Library Outreach Services is the coordinating unit for the coalition.

The organizations that formed the executive committee of the coalition are: the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE); American Association of Advertising Agencies (AAAA); American Library Association; Contact Center, Inc.; B. Dalton Booksellers; International Reading Association (IRA); Laubach Literacy International; Literacy Volunteers of America; National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE); National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS); National Council of State Directors of Adult Education (NCSDAE). There have been three chairpersons for the executive committee: (1) Carol A. Nemeyer, associate librarian for national programs of the Library of Congress; (2) Gary Eyre, executive director of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education; and (3) Violet M. Malone, director of extension services, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The coalition was organized on the premise that the keys to a solution of illiteracy in America lay in calling national attention to the problem and spurring local activity that would bring human and financial resources to bear on the problem. The goal of the coalition's program was to expand or increase the learning resources available to Americans with minimal literacy skills. The program had two objectives: the first was to conduct a three-year multimedia campaign that would inform the nation of the problem of illiteracy within the United

States and the second was to strengthen local-level activity as the solution to the problem.

The coalition's media campaign was officially launched in a press conference held on 12 December 1984 in the Trustees Room of the New York Public Library. The Advertising Council (sponsors of "Smokey the Bear," "Take a Bite Out of Crime," and "A Mind Is A Terrible Thing To Waste") coordinated the media campaign. They recruited the advertising agency of D'Arcy, Masius, Benton & Bowles/Worldwide as volunteers to develop the print and nonprint ads. Two advertising campaign strategies were developed—one to inform and appeal to the general public and the other to raise the awareness of the corporate sector. The theme that was chosen for the general public ads was "Volunteer Against Illiteracy: The Only Degree You Need is a Degree of Caring." The audience was identified as those who wanted to become volunteers to help another person learn to read. The advertising theme developed to appeal to the corporate sector is: "Volunteer Against Illiteracy: A Literate America is a Good Investment." This audience is encouraged to bring corporate/private sector resources to assist national and local literacy activities.

The Advertising Council conducted studies to measure the awareness of communities about adult illiteracy before and after releasing the television and print ads. The campaign is now among the top five social awareness campaigns that the council coordinates. Within the first year of the coalition's advertising campaign, the Ad Council indicators cite that awareness of adult illiteracy has jumped from 21 to 30 percent. The print, radio, and television media have contributed an estimated value of $20 million in advertising space and time to the coalition's campaign.

The second part of the coalition's program was to operate a nationwide toll-free 800-number to provide a linkage between inquiries and local literacy-provider agencies. Since 1985 more than 40,000 volunteers have been referred to local literacy programs. The telephone information and referral service (I&R) is operated by the Contact Center—an organization experienced in running I&R services for exoffenders and runaway youth. They had developed an initial database of nationwide literacy programs in 1978 under the auspices of the American Association of Advertising Agencies. This databank has been expanded and is constantly updated.

The ALA started the coalition with a $15,000 grant from the H.W. Wilson Company. The coalition's program required funding to cover the out-of-pocket costs to develop the media campaign and funds to staff the I&R nationwide toll-free telephone number. Fundraising has been a constant activity of the coalition's executive committee members. Over

one-half million dollars have been raised since 1983 to conduct the work of the coalition. The ALA is the fiscal agent for the coalition and has made a substantial contribution of staff time and resources for keeping the coalition operational. Major funders for the coalition include: the U.S. Department of Education; the Business Council for Effective Literacy; B. Dalton Booksellers; the General Electric Company; the MacArthur Foundation; and the author, Sidney Sheldon. Other groups who have cosponsored coalition activities through "in-kind" contributions or small grants are: Time, Inc.; the American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA); and the Magazine Publishers Association (MPA).

The coalition has had an impact in focusing attention on adult illiteracy. The response from individuals, groups, and organizations may be characterized as both "bandwagon" and "ripple." Although any finite measure of effect on literacy education programs may not be possible, the coalition is undertaking a formative evaluation to assess observable changes between 1981 and 1985. The evaluation, conducted under the leadership of Anabel Newman, Reading Department, University of Indiana, Bloomington, will not be completed until June 1986. There are already notable activities that may be seen as having been influenced by the coalition. Chief among these are the growth of local, regional, or statewide coalitions of literacy activity. Librarians are very involved in those that have developed in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, California, and other states across the country.

The coalition's three-year project has another year-and-one-half before termination. There are already local, state, and national awareness programs in the planning stages. The largest national program will be Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS). Organized by the Public Broadcasting System (PBS-TV) and the American Broadcasting Company (ABC-TV) it will develop television programming and engender or support local community task forces against illiteracy. The project has the endorsement of both the coalition and the ALA. This type of national project will augment and expand the work started by the coalition.

The ALA Washington office's unique role in library legislation is having an enormous impact on the development of literacy programs in libraries. The 1984 Library Services and Construction Act amendments authorized expenditures for literacy programs. The state library agencies in California, Illinois, Kentucky, Florida, New York, and New Jersey are among those that are actively involved in supporting the development of library-based literacy education programs. There are many state library agencies and local libraries that recognize the need but are still not sure of the library's role in literacy education. The role

for libraries in literacy and adult education activities is built on the underlying goal of library outreach services as stated by the OLOS Advisory Committee: "Effective library services must recognize the pluralistic nature of society and address the needs of all facets of the community. The service must be planned and well executed in order to achieve this goal."[20]

The ALA is currently involved in a planning process in which opinions and ideas about its role are being gathered from the association's membership. An area of interest cited by a significant portion of the membership surveyed was libraries and literacy activities. Because ALA has an impressive history and good role models, the association will continue for the remainder of the 1980s to reflect the interest of that portion of the profession that still believes in the educative role of librarians in adult and literacy education.

References

1. Ditzion, Sidney H. *Arsenals of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Public Library Movement in New England and the Middle States from 1850 to 1900.* Chicago: ALA, 1947.

2. Stevenson, Grace T. "The Role of the Public Library in Adult Reading." In *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* vol. 55, pt. 2, edited by Nelson B. Henry, pp. 114-35. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1956.

3. American Library Association, Commission on the Library and Adult Education. *Libraries and Adult Education: Report of a Study Made by the ALA.* Chicago: ALA, 1926, p. 7.

4. Ibid., p. 13.

5. Ibid., pp. 102, 105.

6. Stevenson, "The Role of the Public Library," p. 115.

7. Lee, Robert E. *Continuing Education for Adults Through the American Public Library, 1833-1964.* Chicago: ALA, 1966, p. 56.

8. Birge, Lynn E. *Serving Adult Learners: A Public Library Tradition.* Chicago: ALA, 1981, pp. 48-67.

9. Monroe, Margaret E. *Library Adult Education: The Biography of an Idea.* New York: Scarecrow Press, 1963, pp. 450-66.

10. Smith, Helen Lyman. *Adult Education Activities in Public Libraries: A Report of the ALA Survey of Adult Education Activities in Public Libraries and State Library Extension Agencies of the United States.* Chicago: ALA, 1954.

11. Birge, *Serving Adult Learners,* pp. 91, 93.

12. Lee, *Continuing Education for Adults,* p. 98.

13. MacDonald, Bernice. *Literacy Activities in Public Libraries: A Report of a Study of Services to Adult Illiterates.* Chicago: ALA, 1966.

14. Coleman, Jean E. "Office for Library Service to the Disadvantaged." In *The ALA Yearbook, 1976 Centennial Edition: A Review of Library Events, 1975,* edited by Robert Wedgeworth. Chicago: ALA, 1976, p. 149.

15. Irwin, Paul M. "Adult Literacy Issue, Programs, and Options." In *Issue Brief Updated 10/21/85* (order code IB85167). Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Education and Public Welfare Division (unpublished).

16. Lyman, Helen H. *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries.* Chicago: ALA, 1977.

17. _____ . "Literacy Education as Library Community Service." *Library Trends* 28(Fall 1979):193-217.

18. American Library Association. *ALA Handbook of Organization, 1985/1986, and Membership Directory.* Chicago: ALA, 1985, p. 118.

19. Heiser, Jane C. "The Coalition for Literacy." *Public Libraries* 23(Winter 1984):110-14. (See also: Coleman, Jean E. "Coalition for Literacy." *LAMA Newsletter* 11(Jan. 1985):21-22; and _____ . "Coalition for Literacy: Mobilizing for Action." In *The Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information, 1985 ed.,* compiled and edited by Julia Moore, pp. 106-10. New York: Bowker, 1985.

20. American Library Association and Office for Library Outreach Services. *Principles for the Development of Outreach Programs.* Chicago: ALA/OLOS, 1979.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Meeting the Literacy Challenge: A Federal Perspective

ANNE J. MATHEWS
ADRIENNE CHUTE
CAROL A. CAMERON

> An undetected hearing defect kept Michael White from learning to read as a child. When asked to read aloud in school, "I'd pretend to have something wrong with my eyes and I'd cry." As an adult he couldn't read well enough to decipher signs. "I was like a dog," he says, "I knew my way home and how to get food."[1]

THIS STATEMENT BY AN ILLITERATE MAN conveys some of the feelings of inadequacy and frustration of not being able to read and write, sentiments that are shared by millions of illiterates across the country. Many individuals and organizations are joining the fight against illiteracy. This article focuses on federal efforts to fight illiteracy through library programs.

Two federal programs have supported literacy projects in libraries for the past two decades: the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title I Library Services Program, and the Library Research and Demonstration Program. This article describes some of the projects supported by these two programs, examines current federal library-literacy activities, and discusses ideas for the future.

Anne J. Mathews is Director of Library Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.; Adrienne Chute is a Program Officer, Library Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.; and Carol A. Cameron is a Program Officer, Library Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

BACKGROUND ON LITERACY UNDER LIBRARY R&D AND LSCA TITLE I

There are many ways to define literacy and estimate the number of illiterates. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett gave this definition in testimony in December 1985: "In functional terms [literacy] is the ability to read, write, speak, listen, compute and solve problems in situations that confront adults in everyday life." He estimates that there are 17 to 21 million Americans age twenty and above who are illiterate based on a 1982 Census Bureau English-language proficiency test.[2]

The Library Research and Demonstration Program, Title II-B of the Higher Education Act (HEA Title II-B, Library R&D), and the Library Services Program, Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA Title I) have been the most consistent sources of federal funds for library literacy projects in the past two decades. The Library Programs (LP) office, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), in the U.S. Department of Education (ED) administers both of these grant programs. Although both the Library R&D and the LSCA Title I programs have supported library literacy projects for approximately twenty years, they have done so on a project-by-project basis without any particular emphasis. The grantees—state and local libraries, universities, and other library organizations—have determined the direction of individual projects.

The two programs use different methods of making awards. The Library R&D program is a discretionary grant and contract program. Libraries and other organizations develop proposals and apply directly to the U.S. Department of Education for funding under the program. LSCA Title I, on the other hand, is a state formula grant program. Each state receives a proportionate share of the amount of money appropriated by Congress for the program and develops its own activities in keeping with the statute and regulations. Local libraries design their own projects and apply for funding to their state library agency.

THE EARLY YEARS—LITERACY UNDER LIBRARY R&D

The Library R&D program has funded literacy projects since 1967, its first year of operation. Over $1.4 million supported eight literacy projects from 1967 to 1985, about 5 percent of the total appropriation for the program during that period. Most of the literacy projects were funded between 1967 and 1976 with 1972 being the year of heaviest support—$318,441 (12 percent of the 1972 fiscal year [FY] appropria-

tion) awarded to three literacy projects. In 1976 the program changed its emphasis to focus on projects that could help the library community adapt new technological developments to library services. The program began to emphasize literacy projects again in 1979.

The following is a summary of some of the early literacy projects under the Library R&D program, listed in chronological order. These projects cluster around several themes. The strongest emphases were adult basic education (ABE) and services for new readers. Other themes included literacy materials, planning and cooperation, and the development of manuals.

EARLY LITERACY PROJECTS UNDER THE LIBRARY R&D PROGRAM

—*Library Materials in Service to the Adult New Reader (1967-1971).* The University of Wisconsin—Madison conducted a five-phase research project to develop criteria for evaluating materials that were available to the adult beginning reader. Twelve adult literacy programs in twenty-seven cities were surveyed and interviews were conducted with approximately 500 readers. The study provided a descriptive analysis of adult new readers' social characteristics and activities and their reading behaviors. One result of the study was the development of a checklist giving the criteria for a qualitative and quantitative analysis of adult literacy print materials.

—*The Right to Read for Adults: An Investigation of the Library's Role in a Cooperative Venture with the Model Neighborhood Program (1972).* The Monroe County Library System in Rochester, New York designed the "Adult Right-to-Read" Project in cooperation with the Model Cities program and the Adult Basic Education Department of the City School District of Rochester. The project examined different ways to introduce people to library services. It used library facilities, materials, and staff and complemented an existing ABE program. The project trained staff, acquired materials, and emphasized cooperative efforts by the library, the Model Cities program, and the ABE program to show how cooperative efforts among agencies can provide efficient and effective services.

—*Cooperative Planning to Maximize Adult Basic Education Opportunities through Public Library Extension in Appalachian North Carolina (1972-1973).* This project was designed by the Appalachian State University, the Maryland Technical Institute, and the Avery-Mitchell-Yancey Regional Library to improve the basic literacy

skills of dropouts and adults in three rural Appalachian counties. The project developed a means of measuring the strengths of various ABE strategies and established a profile of student personality factors and utilization patterns. An evaluation of the project indicators showed that: (1) libraries had little effect on the user in relation to literacy efforts; (2) a slight gain in self-concept was found in adults after several months of study in ABE programs; and (3) paraprofessional home visitors helped functional illiterates obtain basic coping skills.

—*The Interrelating of Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults: A Demonstration of Four Alternative Working Models (1972-1973).* This project at Morehead State University in Kentucky studied the relationship between the services of the public library and ABE. Demonstration projects in thirty-one communities in nine states were implemented and training sessions were conducted for public librarians. Some of the project findings were that outreach services and evening and weekend hours were important in providing services for disadvantaged adults; multimedia materials and advertising geared toward new readers were desirable; ABE classes in public libraries were an effective method of ensuring new library users; advisory boards involving undereducated adults were very important; and information and referral services filled a gap in community life.

—*Research Reports-Ethnic Groups for Handbook on the Adult New Reader and His Readings (1973).* The University of Wisconsin—Madison developed a handbook to be used as a guide to analyzing materials for new adult readers. The handbook emphasized materials for several ethnic groups.

—*College Library Prototype Tutorial Program to Prepare Adults for College-Level Equivalency Program (CLEP) Examinations (1975).* The Immaculate Heart College Library in Los Angeles, California developed a prototype tutorial program to prepare adults in the community for CLEP examinations. The project focused on adults who had the potential for getting a college degree but who were unaware of nontraditional avenues to enter college. The project used the college's library resources, faculty consultants, and graduate student tutors.

—*Project to Develop a Manual on Programming for Literacy (1975).* The American Library Association brought together nine librarians from public, school, and college libraries to develop a manual on planning and implementing local literacy programs. The project

also designed a program to demonstrate techniques of implementing literacy projects using the manual as a guide.

—*Libraries in Literacy (1979-1980).* Contract Research Corporation conducted a survey of literacy programs in libraries to develop a base of information on the nature and extent of literacy activities taking place in libraries across the country. Five types of libraries were surveyed: community college libraries, public libraries, public school libraries, state library agencies, and state institutional libraries. The major findings were that libraries were generally reactive in responding to the needs of the functionally illiterate and that many were unaware of the needs in their communities and of other organizations that had literacy education programs. The study also found that libraries that were involved in literacy education were providing a wide range of services and that most literacy programs were in libraries in major urban areas.

In the 1980s the focus of federal support for library literacy projects shifted from the Library R&D program to the LSCA Title I program.

THE 1980s—LITERACY UNDER LSCA TITLE I

LSCA Title I has funded literacy projects in libraries since the 1970 reauthorization of LSCA when Congress added several priority areas, including services to the disadvantaged. The first LSCA Title I literacy projects were funded under this priority area. In the most recent reauthorization of LSCA in 1984, Congress increased its emphasis on literacy making it a separate priority area under Title I and adding Title VI, a new literacy program, to the act.

Many states have given literacy projects increased support since 1980. The amount of federal, state, and local funds spent on LSCA Title I literacy projects has almost tripled in the past five years, increasing from $1.5 million in FY 1980 to $4.2 million in FY 1984. In that same time, the number of projects increased almost two-and-a-half times, from thirty-nine in 1980 to ninety-seven in 1984.

According to the Contract Research Corporation (CRC) Education and Human Development, Inc. survey, *Libraries in Literacy,* funded by the U.S. Department of Education, 53 percent of public libraries in 1980 were actively involved in literacy projects.[3] The Contact Literacy Center in Nebraska reports that 467 public libraries are registered in their directory.[4]

The number of states with LSCA literacy projects has nearly doubled from twenty-six states in 1984 to forty-seven in 1986. Several states have developed particularly strong literacy programs. For example, in 1984 California committed $2.5 million in LSCA funds to the cause of combatting illiteracy. Other states with a strong commitment include: Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

General Trends

Between FYs 1982 and 1984, 250 LSCA literacy projects provided a broad range of literacy services including tutoring in numerous settings from bookmobiles to prisons; courses in English for new Americans; and a high interest/low vocabulary books-by-mail program. The trend was away from smaller projects with a low commitment of funds, such as purchasing literacy materials, to larger projects with higher support levels, such as statewide projects. Another trend was a decrease in adult basic education projects for those with some reading ability and an increase in activities for those with no reading skills. Also, English-as-a-second-language classes decreased and projects using technology increased.

Literacy Materials and Software—Current Developments

The identification of appropriate literacy materials and the development of computer software for literacy programs are two key areas of activities for which LSCA Title I funds have been used since FY 1980.

Materials

A persistent problem in adult literacy programs has been the lack of basic low-level (grades 0-4) reading materials that have the appropriate interest level for adults. Literacy experts have found that materials developed for young adults can be used with adults and that materials developed for adults can be used with children, but that materials developed for children often do not work with adults. It is found that adults are motivated to learn to read when they can link reading to a personal goal such as getting a job, reading the Bible, learning about prenatal care, or getting a driver's license. Also, new adult readers want to blend in with other adults; therefore, it is important that materials look "adult" and not be placed in the children's area of the library.

Selecting materials for literacy programs involves the same judgments of quality as in selecting other library materials with an additional concern about how to determine the level of reading difficulty of a particular book. Many libraries use LSCA Title I funds to acquire and disseminate literacy materials. The following are examples of such projects.

An Ohio activity, "Project Learn," produced and disseminated throughout the state 700 copies of an annotated, highly selective (400 titles) bibliography titled "Books for Adult New Readers: A Selection Aid for Librarians." A key feature of "Project Learn" was that all titles written at the seventh-grade level and below were evaluated by a panel of public librarians, teachers in Adult Basic Education programs, literacy experts, and most importantly, adult new readers before being included in the bibliography.

Connecticut devised a creative approach to the delivery of appropriate materials in their project, "Books by Mail Promotes Adult Functional Literacy." The project made materials available to students and teachers regardless of where they lived in the state. In cooperation with Literacy Volunteers of Connecticut, the project staff selected, annotated, and prepared a minicatalog of high interest/low reading level and English-as-a-second-language materials. The catalog was distributed to literacy volunteers throughout Connecticut. Seasonal supplements to the catalog are also planned.

Maryland's Literacy Resource Center took another approach to providing materials in a central location. Materials in the center were selected especially for adults whose skills were below fourth-grade level and for tutors. Material covers high interest/low level reading, phonics, grammar, basic math, English as a second language, survival, and coping skills. The center also provided assistance regarding teaching techniques and student/tutor motivation.

There is also a growing trend to develop literacy projects that match the culture and interests of the community from which the illiterate comes. While LSCA projects did not emphasize this trend, a few key elements of this type of community literacy approach were reflected in several projects. For example, the Broward County Division of Libraries in Florida developed its own literacy materials using volunteers to produce local literacy materials for projects and to publish literacy newsletters featuring student work.

Software

Several LSCA Title I projects are developing software for use in computer-assisted literacy instruction programs. Software such as

PLATO—which offers testing, diagnosis, basic skills programs, drills, and retesting—is available for higher level readers such as those with eighth-grade reading levels or those preparing for the GED (General Education Degree), but adequate software for the basic level—grades 0-4—has been lacking.

In 1983 the Darlington County Library in South Carolina experimented with using microcomputers to assist illiterates learning to read. The project found that many commercially available software programs were too advanced for adult new readers. A computer program based on Laubach Literacy reading methods was developed in-house by two library staff members in cooperation with reading resource personnel. Students and tutors tested and evaluated the resulting software.

In 1984, another LSCA Title I project at the Jacob Edwards Library in Southbridge, Massachusetts had a computer-assisted literacy program that included materials for limited English-speaking persons since beginner computer software for the limited English-speaking was also lacking.

Program Approaches—Current Developments

There are many program approaches used by literacy projects. Most LSCA Title I projects use the traditional one-to-one tutoring approach, though some LSCA Title I projects focus on community literacy and technology, the other two major types of approaches.

One-to-One Tutoring Programs: A Model

A number of the LSCA Title I projects have been quite successful in using the one-to-one tutoring approach. From our review of these projects over the past five years, we have put together a model of a successful one-to-one tutoring program. The model incorporates elements identified in LSCA Title I projects as key factors in their successes and some successful elements identified in a recent ED study, *Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*.[4] The elements fall into seven categories: (1) planning and administering literacy programs, (2) public and student recruitment, (3) volunteer recruitment and management, (4) tutor training, (5) materials and instructional methods, (6) evaluation, and (7) students. The source(s) from which the successful element was developed is indicated in parentheses.

1. Planning and administering literacy programs:
   —A certified teacher or reading specialist in a key role in the project (Ohio, New York).

—A full-time paid literacy coordinator to serve as the core around which the literacy volunteers are organized (Indiana, North Carolina).

—Project planning that takes into account the fluctuating rates of enrollment, learners waiting, tutor recruitment and training, and that most projects require approximately three months' development to be ready to provide tutoring (California).

—A community literacy partnership formed with adult education, social service agencies, other literacy groups, and the private sector (Indiana).

2. Publicity and student recruitment:

—Awareness that poor recruitment planning threatens the success of literacy programs if uncontrolled public service announcements create long waiting lists, or enrollment drops due to inaccurate program representation (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

—Careful monitoring of phone styles since the first contact by illiterates is often made by phone (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

—Radio, television talk shows, exhibits, and public speaking engagements that reach illiterates in the community. Creative approaches included advertising in the television supplement of local newspapers and on grocery bags (Oklahoma, Florida, Massachusetts).

—Creative use of the private sector. For example, projects contacted local restaurants, bars, Laundromats, doctors, and optometrists to provide a brochure and to request permission to display a poster in their places of business. Literacy brochures also were used as food tray liners at fast food restaurants, placed in monthly welfare recipient checks and in food stamp offices; and posters were displayed on buses (Indiana, *Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

—Former illiterates used to canvass neighborhoods or speak to community groups (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

3. Volunteer recruitment and management:

—Literacy volunteers recruited from the target community. Use of former illiterates to recruit students and volunteers. For example,

Lois Gross, a former illiterate in Kentucky, recruited single-handedly 545 students and 456 tutors in one year (Florida, Kentucky).

—Volunteers recruited from many sectors—e.g., students, retired people, former illiterates, service clubs, and corporations—to meet the need for tutors as middle-class women, long the basis of the volunteer pool, become less available as volunteers (Illinois, New York, California).

—Creative use of volunteers to support other project needs—e.g., child care and transportation for students, producing literacy materials, and fund raising (North Carolina).

—Requirements for volunteers clarified by including specific expectations in a job description. For example, a volunteer might be interested to know that 60 percent of their volunteer time will be spent in direct tutoring and 40 percent in preparation and travel time (California).

—Prospective volunteers and students interviewed to get a sense of their values and needs so that tutor and student are well matched (Illinois). (One tutor problem identified in an evaluation conducted by the Lutheran Church Women was that tutors sometimes talked too much and overwhelmed their students who were not used to verbalizing their thoughts.)

—Monthly calls to each volunteer made to provide support and encouragement (Florida). (An evaluation conducted by the Lutheran Church Women found that 50 percent of tutors never got to the first tutoring session.)

4. Tutor training:

—Basic training for tutors, followed by periodic in-service training, to keep tutors up-to-date. A tutor training handbook developed for the project and a videotape of tutor training produced to serve as a refresher for tutors and to lend to groups in the community (North Carolina, Indiana, South Carolina).

—A cadre of available trained tutors so students who ask for help don't have to wait for a tutor to be trained (North Carolina).

5. Materials and instructional methods:

—Lesson plans and individualized learning plans developed and used. A variety of teaching methods were used to adapt to the learning style of the student (North Carolina).

—Development by project of its own locally oriented materials (Florida).

—Materials selected carefully and included in a catalog (Ohio).

—Literacy materials evaluated and restocked regularly (North Carolina).

6. Evaluation:

—A needs assessment conducted prior to the beginning of the project with continual evaluation during the project (Illinois).

—Testing of students before, during, and after literacy training to evaluate progress (New York, North Carolina).

—Tutors evaluated by students as well as supervisors (Illinois). (An evaluation by the Lutheran Church Women found that some *tutors* were unable to read a tutoring manual written at the eighth-grade level.)

—Student termination tracked and feedback used to improve the program (New York). (Projects have identified high dropout rates due to boredom with materials and lack of support—e.g., lack of child care and transportation services.)

7. Students:

—Students set their own goals and immediate attention is given to these goals. Instruction stops when the student decides (New Jersey, Ohio).

—Orientation with peer counselors provided for new students to allow learners to express their concerns regarding returning to school and to allow fellow students to describe how they overcame obstacles (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

—Group activities provided for students and former students to discuss problems and thoughts even if literacy training itself is one-to-one (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

—Tutors develop supportive relationships with students (New York). (A meaningful relationship with the tutor is cited almost universally by learners when asked why they remain in literacy programs.)

—Tutoring provided at locations and times convenient for students (New Jersey, Ohio).

—Student materials featured in literacy newsletter (South Carolina, Indiana).

—Preadult basic education classes to ease the transition from one-to-one tutoring to a group learning situation (New York).

—Contact students who have "stopped out" temporarily and demonstrate that the adult is missed and a place will be held for his/her return. Many adults will come back, often with renewed purpose (*Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide*).

Community Literacy Programs

Sociologist David Harman of Hebrew University in Jerusalem advocates going even further than traditional one-to-one tutoring. "It's not just an issue of instruction in reading. It's a matter of cultural transformation. Illiteracy is rooted in culture....If you teach skills to a culture in which written language plays no part, they will not learn to read and write."[6] Nina Wallerstein of the University of New Mexico is also a proponent of what she calls "community literacy." This approach assumes that education is inseparable from students' lives outside the classroom. Rather than making literacy the focus of a separate group, preexisting groups in the community are offered literacy training.[7]

Community literacy, translated into actual classroom practice, is a three-step process: listening to student concerns; converting student needs, problems, and strengths into lessons that can be used in literacy programs; and taking positive action to address the concerns. The success of students depends on their overcoming a lack of self-esteem and doubts of their ability to change or to bring about change. Low self-esteem can block learning, but when it is raised the emotional power behind this change can drive and inspire learning.[8]

Several libraries used LSCA Title I funds for library-based programs to support community literacy programs through information and referral services. CLIC (Community Library Information Center) in Prince George's County, Maryland, for example, set up a service to help adult new readers identify and utilize community information resources relevant to their literacy needs. CLIC provided materials and information for adults enrolled in Adult Basic Education, English as a Second Language, and other literacy programs in the county.

Technology Programs

The primary focus of technological literacy projects under LSCA Title I was the interactive use of computers. Some literacy experts regard new technologies as the best hope of reaching 95 percent of illiterates not being reached by current programs.[9] One key component of several successful projects was that they did not use computers to replace the

human element in literacy training. Several projects noted, however, that computers provided great assistance by handling the more routine testing, record-keeping, and other paperwork for both tutors and students, allowing tutors to spend more time teaching.

In 1982 the Wilmington Library in Delaware used LSCA Title I funds for a very popular PLATO project that focused on patrons who tested between third- and eighth-grade reading levels. Participants were tested before they used basic skills programs, were counseled while they used the programs, and were retested after the program was completed.

Another project in the Peoria Public Library in Illinois is currently developing software for the Laubach method of teaching adults to read and is testing three premises:

1. That completion of the Laubach course can be accelerated by using computers to reinforce tutoring.
2. That volunteers can increase the number of students handled by using computers for the repetitive practice portion of the lessons.
3. That the availability of computers will attract students who might otherwise not acknowledge any handicap in reading skills, and will help retain these students in the program.

Videodisc technology is another area being explored. One approach uses a self-paced videodisc that presents pictures and sound. The student does not have to know how to type but merely touches the screen to indicate his response to the instructions.

In 1987 the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners plans to use LSCA Title I funds to experiment with cable television as a teaching medium. As they stated in their LSCA Annual Plan:

> Research indicates that there is a need for literacy programming for grade levels of 0-4. There is also a need to experiment with library outreach to the target group who, for a number of reasons, including work schedules or personal embarrassment, cannot or will not take advantage of tutoring at the local library. At the same time, outreach is needed to supplement the tutoring effort conducted at the local public library.
>
> Cable television offers an attractive means to reach people outside of the library environment. People could watch programming in the privacy of their own homes at times more convenient than those offered by the library and the pool of tutors. However, we have not found (in an international search) an adequate series of programs aimed at the 0-4 level for CATV broadcast. Therefore, we will develop a series of between six and twelve half-hour programs for levels 0-4 for broadcast by cable stations in communities in Massachusetts with a large population of the target group.[10]

Service to Special Groups—Current Developments

Large segments of the functionally illiterate population are composed of subgroups with special needs that require specially designed literacy projects. The LSCA program has shown leadership in responding to these needs with projects designed especially for families, young adults, disabled, institutionalized, and limited English-speaking.

Family Literacy

Literacy training begins at home. A 1986 U.S. Department of Education publication, *What Works,* outlines commonsense steps that families can take to provide a good education for their children. While one might know intuitively many of these ideas, each has the benefit of being validated through research. *What Works* gives the following recommendations for preliteracy training for families to use as guidelines in their children's education:

1. The best way for parents to help their children become better readers is to read to them—even when they are very young.
2. A good foundation in speaking and listening helps children become better readers.
3. Children who are encouraged to draw and scribble "stories" at an early age will later learn to compose more easily, more effectively, and with greater confidence than children who do not have this encouragement.
4. A good way to teach children simple arithmetic is to build on their informal knowledge. This is why learning to count everyday objects is an effective basis for early arithmetic lessons.
5. In order to enrich the "curriculum of the home," some parents: provide books, supplies, and a special place for studying; observe routines for meals, bedtime, and homework; and monitor the amount of time spent watching TV and doing after-school jobs.[11]

Some examples of family literacy activities in LSCA Title I projects follow. In 1983 Framingham Public Library in Massachusetts set up an attractive Early Literacy Center in the children's room, well stocked with carefully selected materials, including references for parents. A knowledgeable parent advisory committee met monthly to contribute ideas about the kinds of programming that would be beneficial to parents trying to assist in the development of their children's reading and writing skills.

Lawrence Township Public Library in Illinois established a summer literacy reading program in 1985 for first through fifth graders who met the minimum requirements for promotion to the next grade, but who had reading problems. In 1982 the Dekalb Library System in Decatur, Georgia set up a Homework Center in this low-income Atlanta

suburb where traditional services had been ineffective. An average of sixty-five students came each afternoon to the center for a quiet place to study and some personalized tutorial help from professional staff. They typed their reports on the center's typewriter, viewed education programs on the audiovisual equipment, and operated the center's Apple II computer, the same kind of computer used by Dekalb schools. School officials provided copies of computer programs that the children used in class.

Young Adults

Young adults have special needs. Adolescence is often a period of confusion, strong emotions, identity crisis, and challenges to adult values, words, and behavior. New roles are tried and discarded. Social workers have noted that the best access to young adults often is via peer groups that are influential in this phase of development. Group work can be far more effective than the traditional one-to-one approach. With LSCA Title I support, Englewood Public Library in New Jersey developed a young adult literacy project that took this factor into account. The project featured group tutoring experiences where students "dropped-in" at predesignated hours. An adult was always available to provide backup support, and a corps of teen tutors was trained. A teen advisory council was formed and teens helped in adapting or designing training materials.

Disabled

There is a growing awareness that many physically handicapped persons have not benefited from special education and need special literacy efforts. For example, literacy is sometimes a problem for the hearing impaired since oral language skills must be developed prior to reading, putting a deaf person at a distinct disadvantage. In 1985 Nebraska installed a TTD (telecommunication device for the deaf) machine at the Contact Literacy Center to give deaf illiterates access to its hotline.[12]

The LSCA program funded several literacy projects for the developmentally disabled. The Mansfield-Richland County Public Library in Ohio extended services to 350 developmentally disabled and functionally illiterate adults identified by area agencies. Three in-depth staff awareness sessions were held. Materials were ordered and a catalog of the materials prepared and distributed to group homes, area agencies, classroom teachers, users living independently, and to the library. In another project in 1984, the Fairview Training Center in Oregon

planned to develop an alternative to traditional special education methods for the mentally disabled, using a combination of computer-assisted instruction and computer-assisted video instruction.

Institutionalized

Illiteracy among prisoners in some states is estimated at 60 percent and the average youthful inmate reads at the 6.9 grade level.[13] Over $6.5 billion is spent per year on 700,000 illiterate prison inmates.[14] The LSCA program has been very responsive to the need for literacy programs not only in prisons but in other types of institutions. From 1982 through 1984, forty-one institutional literacy projects were funded under the program. The major emphasis of these projects was new technology, GED preparation, purchasing high interest/low reading level materials, and tutoring.

Under LSCA Title I, the Oakhill Correctional Institution in Madison, Wisconsin developed a technology-based Literacy Center that is being replicated in other institutions and public libraries in Wisconsin and in some out of state. The major features of the project include:

1. A literacy librarian.
2. Resident volunteers trained as peer tutors.
3. Computerized literacy instruction for those with a reading level of grade 2 and up with an emphasis on reading, grammar, spelling, and math.
4. One-to-one tutoring for those with no literacy skills, using a phonetic teaching method.
5. A core collection of basic skills software suitable for correctional institutions.
6. An internal referral network comprised of teachers and social workers.
7. Written guidelines with annotations that can be used as an acquisitions model for similar projects.
8. An English as a second language (ESL) component.
9. Vocational and occupational computer software collection for prerelease training.

People With Limited English-Speaking Ability

It has been found that speaking English precedes learning to read and write in English. Many LSCA Title I projects focused on people who cannot speak or read in English. No fewer than nineteen languages or language groups were covered in LSCA limited English-speaking programs in 1984: (1) American Indian dialects, (2) Cambodian,

(3) Chamorro, (4) Chinese, (5) French, (6) German, (7) Hebrew, (8) Hmong, (9) Italian, (10) Japanese, (11) Khmer, (12) Korean, (13) Laotian, (14) Polish, (15) Portuguese, (16) Russian, (17) Spanish, (18) Vietnamese, and (19) Yiddish.

Roughly one-third of illiterates age twenty and above were born abroad and speak a non-English language at home.[15] Each year an estimated 1.4 million refugees and immigrants not literate in English are added to the pool of adult illiterates.[16] These individuals fall into four different categories, each of which needs to be approached differently: (1) those who speak a language for which there is no written form (preliterates); (2) those who speak a language for which there is a written form but who do not read or write themselves (illiterates); (3) those who are able to read and write on an elementary level in their native language (semiliterates); and (4) those literate in their native language but who must learn the Roman alphabet to learn English (non-Roman alphabetics).[17] Some LSCA Title I projects are designed to reach people in these categories. For example, in their 1986 project "Pre-English as a Second Language: Literacy in Spanish as a First Step" the Universidad Popular and the Chicago Public Library are cooperating in a literacy program that teaches Spanish-speaking adults how to read and write in Spanish.

One of the problems identified in English-as-a-second-language classes is that it is difficult to deal with diverse literacy levels, cultures, and learning styles in one class. The LSCA program responded by funding a number of projects in which ESL tutoring was on a one-to-one basis. For example, Bergenfield Public Library in New Jersey successfully tutored 300 non-English speaking persons on a one-to-one basis. Some tutors worked with two students, often from the same family. A strong collection of ESL materials was developed and the library referred students who "graduated" from this program to the local Adult Education Program.

In 1985, the Jones Library in Amherst, Massachusetts planned to use LSCA Title I funds to write a guide to library ESL resources, arrange for its translation, and distribute copies to the Hampshire County Cambodian community and to tutors. In 1986 Oklahoma hoped to videotape ESL tutor training sessions and make them available statewide.

Statewide Coalitions—Current Developments

Secretary of Education William J. Bennett has noted that the states must play a primary part in addressing both the dropout problem and

illiteracy, indicating that these are two national problems that do not lend themselves to a Washington solution.[18] States have recognized this and are taking on a growing role in literacy efforts. One of the most notable trends in the LSCA program is the establishment of statewide literacy councils or coalitions in thirty-three states.[19] State library agencies are active partners in most of these statewide planning bodies, and in some cases library leaders were directly responsible for their creation.

Statewide coalitions are supported with LSCA Title I funds in many states. Some of the activities of these coalitions follow.

1. A statewide information and referral service on literacy (Minnesota).
2. Manuals for starting a literacy program (Kentucky).
3. A statewide literacy conference (Virginia).
4. A speakers' bureau with literacy experts (Indiana).
5. A statewide literacy newsletter (Indiana).
6. A ten-year statewide literacy plan (Indiana).
7. The development of a tool to help companies assess literacy needs of their employees, calculate the costs of illiteracy to the company, and identify appropriate instructional strategies (Indiana).
8. A directory of literacy-service providers in the state (Massachusetts).
9. A literacy program in the state government to match state employees who need literacy training with other state employees who can serve as tutors (Illinois).
10. Hearings across the state to gather information on the extent of the illiteracy problem, what the communities are doing to address the problem, and how the state council might assist (Illinois).
11. A statewide literacy hotline (Illinois).
12. Assistance to local cooperative literacy ventures to move from informal to formal structures via contracts and memoranda of understanding (California).
13. The requirement of local coordination as a condition of grant funding (Illinois).
14. A literacy logo for the state (California).
15. Literacy proclamations and resolutions by state and local governing bodies and officials from such organizations as the Boy Scouts, churches, service clubs, and ethnic associations (California).
16. Broad involvement of other state-level agencies—e.g., Indian Affairs, Mental Health, Corrections, Human Services, and Education (Oklahoma).
17. Presentations at state conferences of service groups—e.g., Lions Club, Urban League, Firefighters Association (Oklahoma).

18. Representatives of labor, the media, and corporations included in the statewide literacy council (Illinois).
19. Local military bases involved in literacy projects (California).
20. An application to the Library of Congress to become a local center for the book (Oklahoma).
21. Regional literacy programs in rural areas for illiterates who do not want to be recognized receiving literacy training in their own small local community (Oklahoma).

EVALUATION AND RESEARCH NEEDS

The lack of adequate needs assessments and program evaluations contributes to the disagreement in the literacy field on the definition of literacy, the number of illiterates, and the best approach to the problem. Methods for evaluating program effectiveness are often poorly defined and the demand for tutors does not leave sufficient time to evaluate projects. Some experts advocate that needs assessments be conducted in localities nationwide. Most projects do not employ control groups to compare the achievements of groups of persons receiving training with groups of persons not receiving training. In its recommendations for a national literacy policy, the Coalition on Literacy notes that evaluation money is needed for community-based programs that reach adults who read at the 0 to 3 grade reading level.[20] Potentially, the LSCA and Library R&D programs could make significant contributions in these areas of evaluation.

Secretary of Education William Bennett includes "research that guides policy and informs practice" as a key part of the department's Literacy Initiative.[21] Several areas where more information is needed have been identified in this review of LSCA Title I projects. These areas could be researched and developed as part of LSCA literacy projects, Library Research and Demonstration projects, or through private sector research projects. Examples of these research suggestions include:

1. An online, computerized database of high quality literacy print and software materials with critical annotations. Access would be by subject as well as title and reading level.
2. Computer software with voice component developed for adults with 0 to 4 grade reading levels.
3. An impact study of how former illiterates' lives have been affected by becoming literate.

4. Research on the dropout rate in library literacy projects. What elements cause it? What can be done about it?
5. Development of a matrix of potential literacy target groups (poor, young adult dropouts, families, employees, children, new Americans, disabled, institutionalized, elderly, urban, rural); tutoring methods (phonics, etc.); materials (books, software, newspapers); settings (library, school, home) and modes (classroom, one-to-one, informal group); and types of tutors. Identify the most effective means of helping illiterate populations.
6. Research on the most effective and low cost marketing strategies to attract tutors and students.
7. Study of the applicability in the United States of other countries' successful approaches to adult literacy development.
8. Research on the most effective methods for training tutors.
9. Research on the interaction between illiterates and tutors to determine which tutors are most effective—i.e., how well do middle-class tutors relate to low socioeconomic status (SES) students?
10. Research on the most effective uses of technology in library based literacy projects.
11. Research on the difference between the way children learn to read and the way adults learn to read.
12. Research on how well literacy programs serve learning disabled illiterates. Volunteer tutors generally do not have the technical background needed to recognize and help learning disabled illiterates. A simple screening device could be developed that would distinguish learning disabled illiterates from those whose illiteracy stems from other causes and that could refer the learning disabled to appropriate help—e.g., special education teachers.

MOVING AHEAD

Public and private organizations are actively pursuing new ways of meeting the literacy challenge. The Contact Literacy Center in Lincoln, Nebraska, for example, has formed a nationwide computerized directory of literacy organizations and maintains a toll-free phone number that can be used as a clearinghouse for potential students and tutors.[22] ABC-TV and the Public Broadcasting Service recently announced Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS) which will operate in two phases: outreach and community awareness. So far, forty national organizations have pledged their support to establish activities on the local level, and local

television stations will set up literacy task forces in their communities. National network programs will begin in September 1986 after outreach programs have been set into motion.[23] Programs will include documentaries and spots on shows such as "ABC News Nightline" and "World News Tonight." Both networks will provide a continuous focus on illiteracy in public service announcements.[24]

The federal government has also set up several new initiatives. In April 1985, two bills (S.J. Res. 112 and H.J. Res. 244) were introduced in Congress for a second White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1989 with literacy as one of its themes. In addition, the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE), whose goal is to maximize federal resources through interagency cooperation, has sponsored a survey of adult literacy programs in the federal government to determine what the government was currently offering in support of literacy. The survey identified seventy-nine federal programs that in FY 1985 provided a total of $347.6 million for literacy-related activities.[25] A directory of these activities was produced.

Fighting illiteracy is also a high priority of the U.S. Department of Education. Secretary Bennett has asked all ED offices to examine ways they can help support literacy activities, and he has directed the Adult Literacy Initiative staff to coordinate education programs that have adult literacy components and to promote literacy efforts at all levels.

The Library Programs office has two new literacy initiatives underway. The first is a contract awarded in 1985 under the Library R&D program to the University of Wisconsin—Madison to update the 1979 survey of library literacy activities. This new study will also assess the current status of libraries in literacy education, determine or project an expanded role for libraries in literacy education, identify and describe some literacy programs, and assess the application and effectiveness of new technologies in literacy educational services.

The second initiative is the new Library Literacy Program under LSCA Title VI. This program was established by Congress when it reauthorized LSCA in 1984. Under this discretionary grant program, state and local public libraries will apply directly to the U.S. Department of Education for grants to support library literacy projects. Basically, state public libraries can coordinate and plan library literacy programs and arrange for training for librarians and volunteers to carry out such programs. Local public libraries can promote the use of voluntary services of individuals, agencies, and organizations in providing literacy programs; acquire library materials for literacy programs; and use library facilities for literacy programs. Grants are limited by statute to $25,000. FY 1986 was the first year of operation of the program

with 241 grants totaling $4,783,410 awarded to state and local public libraries to support literacy projects in forty-six states.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

It is important to remember that literacy goes beyond the ability to read and write. Once those skills are mastered, literacy becomes a way of enriching one's life and contributes to the enrichment of society. Jonathan Kozol, author of *Illiterate America*, says the real cost of illiteracy is that it is an insult to democracy. People who cannot read can neither "choose" in a restaurant nor "choose" in the voting booth. He purports that the "Art of War" is a national priority while the "Art of Living" is left to volunteers.[26]

The challenge is there for all—the federal government, state and local governments, the private sector, families, volunteers, and illiterates. Rather than dispute literacy figures, definitions, and methods, rather than debate who is doing more and who less, we must recognize that there is enough illiteracy for all of us. All our efforts are needed in the battle against illiteracy. The challenge is to work in partnership to win the war.

References

1. Machalaba, Daniel. "Hidden Handicap: For Americans Unable to Read Well, Life is a Series of Small Crises." *Wall Street Journal*, Eastern ed., 17 Jan. 1984, p. 1.

2. Bennett, William J. "Testimony Before the Senate Republican Conference Task Force on Education and Literacy." Washington, D.C., 4 Dec. 1985, p. 1.

3. Smith, Ester Gottlieb. *Libraries in Literacy Volume I.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, 1981, p. 30.

4. Business Council for Effective Literacy. "Libraries and Literacy." *Newsletter for the Business Community*, Jan. 1986, p. 4.

5. Lerche, Renee S., ed. *Effective Adult Literacy Programs: A Practitioner's Guide.* New York: Cambridge, 1985.

6. "Adult Literacy Challenge Growing, Experts Say." *Education Daily*, 30 Jan. 1984, p. 4.

7. Wallerstein, Nina. "Literacy and Minority Language Groups: Community Literacy as Method and Goal" (prepared for the National Adult Literacy Conference, Washington, D.C., 1984), n.p.

8. Ibid.

9. McGraw, Harold W. "A Message to Corporate CEOs." *Newsletter for the Business Community*, Sept. 1984, p. 1.

10. Board of Library Commissioners. *Library Service and Construction Act: Annual Program for Title I* (project no. 12.01). Boston, Mass.: Board of Library Commissioners, 1986.

11. U.S. Dept. of Education. *What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, 1986.

12. Nebraska Library Commission. "Library Service and Construction Act: Annual Program for Title I (project no. 85.2). Lincoln, Neb.: NLC, 1985, unpublished.

13. Skaptason, Trish. *Library Services to the Institutionalized: Fiscal Year 1984.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Library Programs, Public Library Support Staff, 1986, p. 2.

14. California State Library. *Data Sheet-Adult Illiteracy: Selected Statistics.* Sacramento: California State Library, n.d.

15. Bennett, "Testimony Before Senate Republican Conference," p. 4.

16. Bush, Barbara. "Our Reading Problem." *Washington Post,* 2 Aug. 1984, p. A19.

17. Savage, Lynn K. "Teaching Strategies for Developing Literacy Skills in Non-Native Speakers of English" (prepared for the National Adult Literacy Conference). Washington, D.C.: 1984, p. 1.

18. Bennett, "Testimony Before Senate Republican Conference," p. 6.

19. Ibid.

20. Coalition for Literacy. *Recommendations for a National Literacy Policy.* Chicago: Coalition for Literacy, n.d.

21. Bennett. "Testimony Before Senate Republican Conference," p. 8.

22. "Literacy Awareness." *ODL Source: A Newsletter Published by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries* 9(April 1984):3.

23. "ABC, PBS Launch Campaign to Tackle Illiteracy." *Higher Education Daily,* 11 Dec. 1985, p. 2.

24. "PLUS on Prime Time." *American Libraries* 17(Feb. 1986):94.

25. Kahn, Mary E. *Literacy Management Information Project Report Volume I.* Washington, D.C.: Washington Consulting Group, Inc., 1986, p. iii (prepared for the Federal Interagency Committee on Education under Contract No.300-85-0185).

26. Kozol, Jonathan. "Illiterate America" (address at conference: "Building Partnerships for Literacy: Libraries and the Community," Richmond, Va., 9-11 Oct. 1985).

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Adult Illiteracy: State Library Responses

GARY E. STRONG

"I ASKED MYSELF, why the public library? And, then I realized that is where you go to read." These words of an adult learner define the role of the library in literacy services most effectively. This institution has always been concerned with learning—the sharing of human knowledge. The emerging role as information center has not replaced the public library's traditional role as "the people's university." The planning for learner services is often left to the desire of local public libraries while state library agencies are more concerned with the "broader issues of library development." Within the past three years, however, concern for the plight of the adult illiterate has received attention by state governments in library development planning. The purpose of this article is to examine a number of these efforts and to provide an in-depth examination of the efforts of the California State Library in conducting the California Literacy Campaign.

Conference in Urban Literacy: Summary of State Initiatives

As background for the Second National Conference on Urban Literacy held on 17 and 18 June 1985 in Monterey, California, Jean Hammink with B. Dalton Bookseller prepared a summary of state literacy initiatives. Her summary reported that thirty states have some level of interest in adult literacy, though the statewide literacy initiatives vary a great deal from state to state in their degree and scope. The thirty

Gary E. Strong is State Librarian of California, California State Library, Sacramento, California.

states were: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

Only twenty states have a formal structure for the coordination of adult literacy service-providers. They are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

Eleven states have the public support of the governor or have appointed a statewide group to deal with adult literacy. These are: California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee. With respect to providing state legislation for adult literacy, only nine states have taken steps to propose or approve such legislation. They are: California, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Washington. Six states reported active involvement of the private sector in their literacy campaign—Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Texas.

The report indicates that:

> Most statewide efforts have been initiated and coordinated by three groups. Leadership in many states has come from the Adult Basic Education Program, the library system, or state volunteer organizations. Second, many states have also responded to initiatives by the United States Department of Education. A letter was sent in 1984 to all governors from former Secretary of Education Terrell Bell. Lastly, many statewide efforts have developed in response to a call for action from Harold McGraw, Jr., President of the Business Council for Effective Literacy, to all governors.[1]

Survey Results

In an effort to examine the role of state library agencies and the public libraries of various states, a survey of the chief officers of state library agencies was conducted in August and September of 1985. Several states responded with information concerning their efforts. While responses were not received from all states, this summary provides an account of representative activities.

In Colorado the Colorado Literacy Action was started in January of 1985. Its goals are to create an awareness within the general public of the

existence of nonliterate adults and of the need for appropriate instructional programs for them. Eight conferences have been sponsored, press releases have been issued, and radio and television interviews focusing on literacy have been conducted. A clearinghouse of human and material resources has been developed and made available for community use. The clearinghouse functions to fill requests for literacy-related information—i.e., methods, materials, program development, and fundraising—and for training and aligning volunteer tutors with programs. The third area of activity is to promote the development of local coalitions that will build on existing resources. Seven programs were reported to be in the beginning stages of development.[2]

The Connecticut State Library awarded funds to twenty-one public libraries in 1984/85 for literacy activities. Eighteen of the projects were funded to work with the Literacy Volunteers of Connecticut affiliates based in their communities and to acquire materials to support and supplement the local affiliate tutoring programs. The other three libraries were funded for the purpose of initiating a tutor training program. The State Library and Literacy Volunteers of Connecticut held six workshops in 1985 for the purpose of discussing the literacy volunteers program and to explore the role of the public libraries in helping adults learn to read.

Sixteen state-supported institutional libraries were funded for the purchase of high interest/low reading level materials in English. An information packet which included a bibliography of resources, an idea sheet on how libraries could help literacy programs, and the New Readers' Press booklet, "Opening Doors for New Readers," was sent to all public and institutional libraries in November 1984.

Governor William O'Neill has appointed a Connecticut Coalition on Literacy which held its first meeting on 5 December 1985. The coalition has twenty-five members representing the public and private sectors, including the president of the Connecticut Library Association, Association of Connecticut Library Boards, a White House Conference delegate, and the state librarian.[3]

The Deleware Division of Libraries began programs through the State Library Advisory Council to reach the more than 51,000 Delaware residents who are functionally illiterate by awarding LSCA (Library Services and Construction Act) grants to coordinate efforts of the Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. Another literacy effort is the LSCA funded project "Library Reading Skills." In an effort to fight adult illiteracy in central and lower Delaware, the state library initiated STAR—service to train adult readers. Public libraries throughout the state are providing community referrals for interested volunteer tutors

and students, are providing meeting space for the tutors and students, and are assisting with collection materials suited for the beginning adult reader.

The Delaware Coalition for Literacy has been formed with the Delaware Division of Libraries as one of the founding members. The coalition, working in cooperation with the national Coalition for Literacy, is an alliance of organizations working together toward the eradication of adult illiteracy in Delaware.[4]

The State Library of Florida has taken a very active role in literacy efforts. More than $1.5 million in LSCA grants have been awarded to local public libraries in support of local literacy efforts. A literacy consultant is available to coordinate and work with other agencies, organizations, and individuals concerned with adult illiterates and to provide technical and consulting services to libraries interested in initiating and/or expanding services to the adult new reader. Counties may use some of their state aid funds to purchase adult new reader collections.

The Florida State Library and other public and institution libraries have joined the Florida Literacy Coalition, Inc. The Florida State Library is a founding member of the coalition and has representation on the board of directors. Approximately 100 individuals, agencies, and organizations have joined as dues-paying members of the coalition. The Adult Literacy Act (Section 84-336 *Laws of Florida*) creates an adult individualized literacy instruction program for adults possessing less than a fourth-grade education. The Florida commissioner of education has administrative responsibility for implementation of the act in coordination with the State Board of Community Colleges, local school boards, and the Division of Library Services of the (Florida) Department of State. Additional funding may be provided from legislative appropriations as well as private sources in order to achieve maximum benefits for eliminating adult illiteracy in Florida. Several county libraries have been successful in getting local government officials to sign proclamations and resolutions commemorating "National Literacy Week." A number of private industries have supported local and statewide literacy efforts such as B. Dalton Bookseller, United Way, Southern Bell, American Express, and Gannett Newspaper Foundation, among others.[5]

The Illinois State Library coordinates the adult literacy initiative in Illinois under the auspices of the Illinois Literacy Council. The council, appointed by Governor James Thompson in May 1984, is chaired by Secretary of State Jim Edgar serving in his capacity as state librarian. Illinois State Library staff plan and direct the activities of the council, initiate legislative proposals in support of the literacy effort,

and publish a newsletter and resource materials on behalf of the council for distribution to local programs, state agencies, and the private sector. The Illinois State Library works closely with the Illinois State Board of Education and the Governor's Office of Voluntary Action in promoting coalition building and cooperation among libraries, education agencies, and community-based literacy programs (including Laubach and Literacy Volunteers of America), volunteer organizations, and the private sector.

The Illinois State Library has awarded more than $.5 million in LSCA grants to library systems or local public libraries to develop and expand literacy programs with a volunteer component. All libraries and library systems receiving funds have coordinated their literacy programs with area education agencies that receive funding for literacy projects through the Illinois State Department of Education. More than twenty-five local or regional literacy councils have been established as a result of these efforts.

The Illinois General Assembly passed legislation in June 1985 appropriating $2 million for a literacy grant program to be administered by the secretary of state through the Illinois State Library. The legislation was developed by the State Library upon recommendation of the Illinois Literacy Council.

Many local programs and local and regional councils are successfully generating private sector support. The Illinois State Library is providing direction and technical assistance through workshops at two statewide literacy conferences sponsored jointly with the Illinois State Board of Education.[6]

The major effort of the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives (KDLA) Adult Services Program is literacy training. There are currently thirty-five programs, encompassing thirty-five counties, that are directly funded through the state library agency using LSCA Title I funding. An additional nineteen programs have been initiated by KDLA regional staff who have provided training and materials. Additionally, three county libraries are providing literacy programs by using grant funds from the Kentucky Department of Education awarded to KDLA for literacy efforts.

The literacy programs are coordinated by one central office staff person and four regional coordinators. The regional staff are responsible for initiating local programs, organizing local literacy councils, and training volunteer tutors. The statewide library literacy program coordination is accomplished by the adult services coordinator. This coordinating function ensures continuity between programs, equal distribution of materials, and uniform data collection. The regional

coordinators each work in an eight to ten county area. They provide the impetus to start the local program and in many cases actually form the local literacy councils, recruit and train volunteers, and recruit students.

The Kentucky Department for Library and Archives provides grants for literacy efforts to regional library boards. This was begun in 1981 starting with one region, growing to two regions in 1982, and to five in 1983. Currently, fully funded programs operate in five regions. Total funding for these five projects is $102,000 (FY 1986). The major effort during 1985 is to add uniformity to the locally initiated library literacy programs through the standardization of training and program operation. A guide for local library literacy programs is in the draft stages.

During the summer of 1985, the Kentucky General Assembly meeting in special session created the Kentucky Literacy Commission (KRS 158.790) as a statutory body (the state librarian is a permanent member) and resolved to appropriate state funding for literacy programs.[7]

In Louisiana a state literacy council has been created with representation from the Louisiana State Library. The state library does not provide funding for literacy programs. A Louisiana coalition for literacy has been formed and has applied for a federal grant to hold a state conference on literacy which would involve the state library.[8]

The Maryland Division of Library Development and Services is a member of the Maryland Literacy Council. Programs are assigned to a staff member who has taken a leadership role in encouraging the development of literacy programs, has organized statewide meetings, and has planned workshops and other training.[9]

There are nineteen public libraries presently involved in literacy projects in Massachusetts under LSCA grants from the Board of Library Commissioners. There is not presently a statewide literacy coalition, but activities are supported by the Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts and the Board of Library Commissioners. Last spring the board published the *Massachusetts Literacy Directory* which includes a listing of all adult basic education preparation classes in the state. Two aspects of the Massachusetts effort have been particularly successful. The first is the computer-assisted literacy project. Supported with LSCA funds, the project provided software programs for use in adult education classes. The second is the provision of technical assistance for Collaboration for Literacy now in its third year.[10]

The Library of Michigan is working in cooperation with the Michigan Library Association, the Michigan Department of Education, and the volunteer organization—Michigan Literacy, Inc.—to develop a

coordinated plan to meet the needs of adult illiterates in the state. Literacy programs in, or coordinated by, local libraries have often proven successful in helping adult illiterates not being reached by school-oriented programs.

The Michigan Library Association provided training at their 1985 annual conference to develop an awareness of the need for literacy programs and to suggest tools to address this need. In addition, the Michigan Department of Education has provided funding for regional and subregional coordinators of a statewide literacy initiative as well as funding for local educational agencies to provide training to adult illiterates.

The Library of Michigan has offered $125,000 in grants from LSCA Title I to assist local literacy groups. The first awards to public libraries were made in early 1986. Applications were received from twenty-four public libraries. The library will provide office space to "Michigan Literacy, Inc." in an effort to increase communication among the volunteer literacy groups as well as between the literacy groups and state agencies.

The Library of Michigan and the Michigan Library Association have issued in April 1986 a "Literacy Workbook" for use by public library directors. The publication will serve as a reference and as a guide, with data on illiteracy in Michigan, a list of literacy groups, sources for more information, a list of recommended library materials, and an outline of the steps to follow to establish a volunteer literacy program.[11]

In Minnesota, Governor Perpich has appointed the Minnesota Adult Reading Campaign Advisory Committee. The state librarian is a member of the committee. The committee is charged with recommending to the governor and the Minnesota Department of Education ways that can be used to expand literacy services in the state. A literacy coalition brings together major state level providers of literacy programs and services. State Librarian Bill Asp chairs the coalition. Current efforts include coordinated publicity and long-range planning for expansion of literacy services. There are no LSCA or state funds earmarked for literacy, but several regional public library systems use LSCA Title I grants for this purpose. The Minnesota Library Foundation is considering offering a grant program for libraries of all types to become involved in literacy activities.[12]

The Mississippi Library Commission has used LSCA Title I funds for a literacy program in the First Regional Library. The program created the first literacy trainers in the state and at least one library

community interest group in each of the five counties served by the library system. Tutors were trained and one-on-one literacy training took place in the local branch libraries. The commission has cooperated with the Mississippi Governor's Office of Planning and Policy and other state agencies to fund four library literacy programs.[13]

The New Hampshire State Library is using LSCA money to conduct a workshop and survey the literacy situation. There are no statewide groups on literacy to which any libraries belong.[14]

The New Jersey State Library has used LSCA funds for the past ten years to support literacy volunteers programs in public libraries and has been a member of several advisory committees to the Department of Education's Adult Education Division in planning their literacy campaigns. In 1985/86 the New Jersey State Library required a literacy program component in the LSCA urban library grants. There is no statewide coalition nor is there legislation specifically referring to literacy activities.[15]

One of the major activities for the New York State Library's Division of Library Development is the statewide development through public libraries of community-based literacy programs for adults and young adults by 1988. Many public libraries have well-developed literacy programs that offer training for tutors and services for students. The New York State Library awarded $265,000 in 1985 for fourteen literacy projects in library systems. Nearly a dozen other projects under the adult independent learner program in public libraries have a literacy component. It is expected that some of the $1 million in state aid for outreach programs in 1985 will be used for literacy services in libraries. Work with volunteer organizations, other units of the education department, and other state agencies as part of a state literacy council has moved to expand the literacy effort in New York State. The New York State Literacy Council presented a teleconference in January 1985 at public television stations across the state to increase literacy service providers' awareness of the Coalition for Literacy Campaign, to promote a dialogue between existing local and regional literacy service agencies, and to provide literacy service agencies with the opportunity to establish a basis for continuing contact and cooperation.[16]

The State Library of Ohio has participated in several ongoing literacy conferences and organizations. The Ohio Literacy Conference resulted in the establishment of a steering committee which will develop a statewide network of literacy professionals and volunteers. The library also participates in the efforts of the Ohio Library Association through the New Readers' Task Force. In June 1985, the Ohio State Library Board awarded three LSCA Title I grants in which literacy and reading

skills were the focus. The Statewide Literacy Network is working to identify businesses that are interested in the promotion of literacy in the state.[17]

"Oklahoma...Do you Read me?" is funded by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries with LSCA funds for 1984 and 1985. Also cooperating is the Oklahoma State Department of Education's Adult and Basic Community Education program. Small grants are made available to help public libraries establish local literacy councils. At the state level there is an agency advisory board with representatives from mental health, corrections, Indian affairs, human services, and education.[18]

The South Carolina State Library acts unofficially as the coordinating state agency for the state's adult literacy initiative in cooperation with the South Carolina Literacy Association, a nonprofit organization. The state library supervises a VISTA literacy program and facilitates communication with the South Carolina State Office of Adult Education, the Governor's Office, the Lieutenant Governor's Office, Educational Television, and the University of South Carolina and involves public libraries at the local level using LSCA grants and other incentives.[19]

The Texas State Library has encouraged literacy activities in public libraries through its Systems Operations Grants to the state's ten regional library systems. Systems are encouraged to use these funds to support local literacy, adult basic education, English as a Second Language, and GED programs. There is not a state-level literacy coalition or council.[20]

The Wisconsin Division for Library Services has been primarily involved in the adult literacy initiative through the LSCA grant program. One literacy grant was sponsored by a public library system and one was awarded to a state correctional institution during 1983/84. In 1984/85 six LSCA grants in the literacy area were awarded. There are ten LSCA grants in 1985/86—nine in public libraries and one in a correctional institution—totaling almost $200,000. Wisconsin does not have a state-level coordinating organization for literacy. The volunteers' councils, which will follow the Laubach Method, are presently trying to organize themselves on a statewide basis.[21]

It is readily evident that each state has approached the battle to eliminate illiteracy in a very different manner. Each state library agency must assess its role and place in the partnership with other organizations and groups that are addressing the problem. Until recently these forces have all too often worked in conflict—i.e., attempting to solve the same problem. Now, it is obvious that the problem is so large that no

one agency or source of funds can handle it alone. The author turns now to a close examination of efforts in California on the part of the California State Library through its California Literacy Campaign. The strength of this effort has been to build programs in coalition with other organizations and groups to address the issue of illiteracy at the state and local level within California.[22]

The California Experience

California is estimated to have at least 2.5 million adults over age sixteen who cannot read and write English well enough to meet their own personal living requirements. (In fact, the California Department of Education estimates the number to exceed 4.5 million persons.) California has many adult basic education programs and a substantial volunteer sector effort which is addressing adult illiteracy. Despite these ongoing efforts' key indicators, such as a high school dropout rate estimated to exceed 100,000 annually, point to the inescapable conclusion that the problem is increasing. The intent of the California Literacy Campaign is to mobilize public libraries with other groups to develop a far larger involvement on the part of Californians and organizations that will be committed to correcting an unacceptable situation—i.e., a severe deprivation to the individual and a serious loss to society.

Under the California Literacy Campaign, illiteracy is defined as the lack of reading and writing skills in English needed to handle the minimal demands of daily living. These are adults who cannot, for example, read traffic signs, product labels, job advertisements, or their children's school report cards; they cannot read to their children; they cannot write checks, fill out application forms, vote, correctly address an envelope, or take a driver's license test.

The purpose of the California Literacy Campaign, as authorized by the California State Library, is to lay the groundwork for a local and statewide long-term structure that will reach and help adults in California attain an English language ability they want and need. The focus of the public library effort through the campaign is on nonreading Californians who speak English. Public libraries are thus targeting their literacy services to those not being served by Adult Basic Education classes or programs in the volunteer sector. The California Literacy Campaign will be successful to the degree that public policy, as established by its local officials, fully acknowledges the damage caused by illiteracy and states endorsement of the need to eradicate it and subsequently commit local resources to help solve the problem.

The method is to initiate a series of local adult literacy programs through the leadership and coordination of California's public libraries. Local assistance grants from the California State Library enable the public library and its community to collaborate fully in a grassroots effort appropriate to reaching more and more of the adults who need help. Public libraries have a vested interest in a reading and informed public, and public libraries want to take a larger role in forming and strengthening that kind of community. Many of the problems that illiterate adults face involve the inability to obtain the information they need and want and the inability to understand and interpret it. This limits their ability to meet the demands that family and society place upon them. These adults have the right to widespread access to programs that will help them where they live and that respond to their particular situations. Libraries are the perfect vehicle to provide assistance in this area of need.

On 8 November 1983, Governor George Deukmejian proclaimed his support for the California Literacy Campaign, initiated by the State Library. The proclamation declared that "it is in the best interests of our society to help stop the spread of illiteracy in California...do hereby urge the citizens and leaders of our state to join me in supporting this important program."[23] The proclamation has served to raise awareness and to encourage local governments to recognize the campaign and to endorse local public library efforts.

On 22 December 1983 the California State Librarian awarded $2.5 million to twenty-seven public libraries to begin the California Literacy Campaign. The various public libraries established programs in over 100 communities under the initial grants. Libraries were encouraged to work with the many agencies who had a long-standing and successful involvement in adult literacy services, such as California Literacy, Inc. and its many local councils; affiliates of Literacy Volunteers of America; community-based education organizations; and the California Adult Education Program. Libraries were charged with creating local literacy coalitions and/or literacy councils and to develop resource collections to serve the community in developing an understanding of illiteracy and its problems. Libraries were also encouraged to work with other community partners such as manpower and employment departments; community outreach programs and neighborhood associations; private industry councils; and women's, ethnic, and student groups in organizing their programs.

With the campaign only a few months old, Assemblyman Tom Bates from Oakland learned of the program and of its limited funding outlook under Library Services and Construction Act funding. He

immediately entered an augmentation request into the state budget process in May of 1984. Nearing the end of its budget deliberations, the legislature acted to include $2,635,000 of state general funds in its budget recommendation to the governor in June 1984. The governor concurred in the proposed budget but required that the California State Library conduct a "program effectiveness review" prior to granting further state funding. The state appropriation was coordinated under the Special Services component of the California Library Services Act (CLSA) and provided the first stable funding available from the state for public library efforts in meeting the need for literacy services in public libraries. The California Library Services Board—which is responsible for administering the CLSA—began immediately to set forth the framework of a state-based program built upon the efforts of the original LSCA projects.

To meet the legislative directive of conducting a program effectiveness review, the state library contracted with Martha Lane, national coordinator of the Volunteer Reading Aides Program of Lutheran Church Women, to complete the program effectiveness review for the necessary budget submittals for the 1985/86 year. Submitted in October 1984, the review stated: "The early accomplishments of the Campaign,...have been truly amazing. Indeed, the California Literacy Campaign has accomplished in eight months what many community-based adult literacy programs would have needed at least two years to do."

There were approximately 3500 adult learners enrolled in campaign projects at the time of the review, most receiving one-to-one tutoring. Approximately 1000 more were referred by the library programs to other community programs more suited to meeting their needs. These referrals included persons too advanced for the projects who were referred to community college or adult school classroom instruction. This referral role of the public library is an important aspect in meeting the campaign's objectives.

The adult learners surveyed were about equally divided between men and women; 53 percent were employed and 51 percent were their family's primary wage earner; 75 percent received no public assistance of any kind. Twenty-four percent had completed eight years or less of schooling. Most heard about the California Literacy Campaign on television or from family members who had learned about it from television or newspapers.

Many adult learners wanted more frequent and longer tutoring sessions. Most expressed a willingness to study via computer (71 percent) or videotape (63 percent) in addition to working with their tutors.

Clearly, the adult learners were serious about improving themselves and confident that the campaign could help them meet their personal literacy goals.

The review also summarized the tutor training programs under the projects and the establishment of neighborhood learning sites. The projects were reported to have generated at least $1,298,000 worth of in-kind contributions (including the volunteers' service hours).

> It is clear that the CLC projects could not have accomplished so much so quickly without the State Library's (1) provisions for and insistence upon program flexibility (so that each project could tailor its reaching and teaching approaches to the specific needs of its particular illiterate adult populations), and (2) easily accessible, always supportive consultant and technical assistance services.

The report concluded that:

> There are some indications that too many tasks were attempted too quickly in the first eight months of the Campaign. There is every indication that, should the Campaign be able to maintain its current level of qualitative and quantitative services, it will be one of the most successful community-based adult literacy programs ever attempted in the United States. Already the California Literacy Campaign has caught the attention of the nation. More important, it seems to be capturing the support and confidence of many of California's functionally illiterate citizens.[24]

In December 1984, the California Library Services Board authorized the award of CLSA funds under the campaign to seventeen more city and county public libraries to establish local services to adults needing basic literacy tutoring. In addition, funds were awarded to the twenty-seven public libraries originally funded under the LSCA start-up program so that they could continue their services. At that time the program was firmly in place, reaching an estimated 5000 adults at over 400 sites in the state. In addition, public libraries not participating in the campaign were offered funds to establish or add to their collections of materials on literacy and illiteracy. Special bibliographies and buying lists were prepared by staff to support this effort.[25]

The governor's budget, which was released in early January 1985, included $3.5 million to continue and to expand the California Literacy Campaign. The program effectiveness review mentioned earlier and the continued attention on the part of the news media were instrumental in securing the increased funding recommendation. That funding was successful through the legislative process and three additional public library programs were added in July 1985.

To address the identified need for increased technical assistance, the *Literacy Technical Assistance Project* final report was issued in February 1985. The purpose of the project was to identify technical assistance needs and resources that would assist community-based literacy programs to better serve adult learners.[26]

In March 1985, the California State Library sponsored a statewide videoconference, *Illiterate America: A Dialogue with Jonathan Kozol.* Seen across California, the videoconference assisted local areas in focusing discussion on the role of the library in local literacy programs. The videotape has been used in several follow-up activities.[27]

Following receipt of the program effectiveness review and analysis of the data, it was felt that additional strategies should be developed to attract not only a more complementary mix of tutors but to find means of more adequately penetrating the communities where potential adult learners were. In April 1985, Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes introduced the "Students for Literacy" act. The bill called for the establishment of a state-funded work-study program to bring eligible postsecondary students together with established library literacy programs to provide tutoring and other related services. The program would be administered by the California State Librarian. The bill appropriated $400,000 to the state librarian for allocation and disbursement to the financial aid offices of postsecondary educational institutions participating in the Students for Literacy Program for the purpose of paying work-study salaries to students selected to participate in the program.

The legislative declaration provided a sound basis for the act:

> (a) A literate citizenry is essential to an effective democracy. (b) At least two million, perhaps as many as four million adults in California are functionally illiterate. (c) The California Literacy Campaign has proven effective in helping many of those adults learn to read and write. However, many illiterate adults are not yet being served. There is also a serious lack of males, minorities, and young people volunteering to serve as tutors in the California Literacy Campaign. A larger pool of tutors and other literacy workers who are more similar in age, sex, and background to those in need of tutoring and who could spend more time working with illiterate adults would enhance the effectiveness of the state's efforts to combat adult illiteracy. (d) Work-study programs are a cost effective means of providing postsecondary students with financial assistance necessary to complete their education, while enhancing self-sufficiency and providing valuable work experience. Bringing students interested in aiding illiterate adults together with adults who want to develop reading and writing skills as a part of a work-study program would be beneficial to all concerned.

The bill passed through the legislature and was forwarded to the governor in July. Governor Deukmejian vetoed the bill, along with numerous other funding measures passed by the legislature, saying in part, "while not issuing a conclusion on the merits of this legislation, I have determined that it cannot be enacted if we are to stay on our prescribed course of fiscal responsibility."[28]

In an effort to more carefully examine the status of literacy in the workplace, the California State Library commissioned Lenny Goldberg and Associates, Oakland, California, to study the situation and recommend policy and program implications for the California Literacy Campaign. Completed in July 1985, the report examines the relationship between illiteracy and the labor market in California.

The report summarizes the problem of illiteracy as it relates to employment from three points of view. For employers, the problem is experienced as (1) a limited pool of qualified workers, particularly for insurance and financial sectors in large urban areas, (2) reduced productivity among the current workforce, (3) increased training and retraining costs as the result of the limited ability of employees to adapt to change, and (4) health and safety problems.

For the unemployed illiterate and semiliterate individual, the problem is experienced as (1) difficulty of finding and keeping a job, (2) inability to qualify for job training programs, and (3) very limited range of work to choose from. In the case of those who are currently employed, the problem is experienced as (1) inability to adjust when plant closures occur; (2) inability to upgrade skills to adapt to technological change; (3) inability to accept promotions which require literacy skills; (4) likelihood of being trapped in low-skill, low-paid, insecure jobs; and (5) health and safety problems.

The study examines the various efforts to address the problem of illiteracy and its impact on the employment and training sector. The report suggests a number of policies and strategies for relating literacy and employment, with particular focus on the public library program. A number of recommendations were also made with respect to actions for the state library.[29]

As the California Library Services Board examined the development of the campaign during its August 1985 meeting, it adopted program changes which extended the state's involvement to five instead of the three year support cycle originally proposed. The need to change this basic support to a longer period of time grew out of the increased concern expressed by the various programs that more time was needed to firmly establish a local commitment of resources. The board's action set

in place a funding formula of 75 percent of the state's maximum contribution during year one, 100 percent during year two, 100 percent during year three, 75 percent during year four, and 50 percent during year five. The library's budget request for 1986/87 was developed based on this new funding policy and amounts to over $5 million to continue the state support and to begin approximately fifteen new programs.[30]

The California Alliance for Literacy held its first meeting in Los Angeles during October 1985. Initiated by the California State Library and the State Department of Education, the alliance is meant to be a forum for those statewide organizations which are addressing the issue of illiteracy in California. Supported by the governor, the alliance will bring together various players to share information, develop common awareness, and make sure that all are kept informed of the tremendous efforts that are underway.[31]

As the California Literacy Campaign matures, there is increasing demand for accountability. The legislator asks, "How can we be sure that people are learning?" or "Is this any more effective than any of the other programs that are addressing the same problem?" These questions and others are quite valid. The first issue in this discussion is the means of reporting and collecting data from the programs and translating it into usable information for decision-making and policy recommendation. Projects begun under LSCA funding with one set of reporting requirements have now been transferred over to state-based and state-funded programs under another statutory authority. New program sites have been funded as the campaign has expanded.

The program directors and state library staff have learned a great deal about what kind of data are needed, even though each program delivers its services differently. To address this concern, revised report forms and instructions were issued in October 1985 to capture more usable data. The revisions were made after in-depth review by program directors and staff at the state library and report forms are undergoing further revision during the first two quarters of the 1986/87 fiscal year.[32]

The continued funding of the campaign is an annual affair with the 1986/87 request forwarded to the governor in October 1985. Results could be reported with pride during hearings with the California Department of Finance. With less than two years of operation, the data begin to tell the story. Taking the statistics from the three months ending 30 September 1985, 7300 adult learners had been instructed during the first quarter of 1985/86; 5550 were being instructed at the end of the quarter; 1700 were awaiting instruction; and 200 had met their goals and left the program. Over 1000 learners had been referred to other programs more suited to meet their individual needs.

Of the learners, 26 percent were white, 14 percent Asian-Americans, 38 percent Hispanic, 15 percent black, 1 percent Native American, 1 percent Pacific Islander, and 5 percent other. Seventy percent of the learners were age sixteen through thirty-nine; half were women, half were men.

For the same period, programs reported that 3400 tutors were instructing at the end of the quarter and 3900 tutors had provided instruction during the three month period. Programs had trained 1450 tutors during the quarter and 2600 volunteers were awaiting tutor training.

Of the tutors, 79 percent were white, 1.5 percent Asian-American, 9 percent Hispanic, 8.5 percent black, 0.5 percent Native American, 0.5 percent Pacific Islander, and 1 percent other. Fifty-five percent of the tutors were age twenty through forty-nine; 26 percent age fifty through sixty-five; and 18 percent sixty-five years and older. One percent of the tutors were age sixteen through nineteen. Twenty percent of the tutors were men and 80 percent women.[33]

The other pressing need is to develop evaluation methods and tools that are not linked to the kindergarten through high school (K-12) educational establishment. Evaluation methods which will allow the learner to more adequately participate in the setting of learner objectives and recording progress toward those objectives will be absolutely imperative if the library-based programs are to retain the confidence of adult learners—many of whom have already failed in the regular educational system. The library role is to build their confidence, provide the learner with basic reading skills, and give the learner the confidence to meet the challenges of living in today's information-based society.

Conclusion

There will continue to be much discussion of the role of the library in providing adult literacy services. A number of state libraries have developed initiatives to address this tremendous challenge. As the United States faces the societal and technological changes of the rest of the century, it is clear that libraries must take a more active role in helping people meet these changes.

The public library and state libraries have a significant opportunity to accept new roles and to expand existing roles in meeting the library, learning, and information needs of their citizens. The California Literacy Campaign has drawn much attention for libraries from the news media, community organizations, and government officials. It has been a means of better explaining what libraries do and how they can

help people in the community. There are, of course, dangers. Libraries might have to make difficult choices among their various traditional programs *v.* new endeavors. They may be faced with new clientele requiring services and information for which libraries are not prepared. But libraries have always indicated that they want to serve the "whole community" and that they want to "reach out."

In a study of "how libraries help," completed for the California State Library in October 1985, Brenda Dervin and Benson Fraser found that a surprising number of individuals used their library for something they call "literacy services." Further, it was found that these individuals were helped in more ways by their visit to the library (the one in which they used "literacy services") than others surveyed. They were the highest in reporting the help *felt connected/not alone;* and near the top for *got ideas/understandings; found directions/got skills/reached goal;* and *got support/emotional control.*[34]

Each state must evaluate its resources and determine its role in addressing the plight of the adult illiterate in its state. All trends point to a responsible willingness by more and more states to stop ignoring the issue of adult illiteracy and working to involve libraries in solving it.

References

1. National Conference on Urban Literacy, 2d sess. "Report." Monterey, Calif., 17-18 July 1985, pp. 5-6.
2. Chandler to Strong, personal communication, 13 Aug. 1985.
3. Owens to Strong, personal communication, 9 Sept. 1985; and Walters to Strong, personal communication, 9 Dec. 1985.
4. Short to Strong, personal communication, 12 Dec. 1985.
5. Wilkins to Strong, personal communication, 14 Aug. 1985.
6. Lamont to Strong, personal communication, 10 Sept. 1985.
7. Gleich to Strong, personal communication, 17 Dec. 1985.
8. Jacques to Strong, personal communication, 6 Aug. 1985.
9. Travillian to Strong, personal communication, 14 Aug. 1985.
10. Quezada to Strong, personal communication, 10 Dec. 1985.
11. Fry to Strong, personal communication, 20 Dec. 1985.
12. Asp to Strong, personal communication, 30 July 1985.
13. Woodburn to Strong, personal communication, 28 Aug. 1985.
14. Adamovich to Strong, personal communication, 31 July 1985.
15. Weaver to Strong, personal communication, 6 Aug. 1985.
16. Shubert to Strong, personal communication, 22 Aug. 1985.
17. Cheski to Strong, personal communication, 15 Aug. 1985.
18. Vesely to Strong, personal communication, 30 Aug. 1985.
19. Callahan to Strong, personal communication, 7 Aug. 1985.
20. Crosby to Strong, personal communication, 8 Aug. 1985.
21. de Usabel to Strong, personal communication, 14 Aug. 1985.

22. See these for more information on the California Literacy Campaign: Strong, Gary. "Public Libraries and Literacy: A New Role to Play." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 59(Nov. 1984):179-82; and Ruby, Carmela. "'It's Bad When You Can't Get Your Dreams': The California Literacy Campaign." *Public Libraries* 23(Winter 1984):116-18.

23. Governor, State of California, "Proclamation," 8 Nov. 1983.

24. Lane, Martha A., et al. *California Literacy Campaign: Program Effectiveness Review*. California State Library, 1984.

25. Strong to Directors of public libraries not participating in CLC, personal communication, 1 Feb. 1985.

26. Bennett, Al, and Mayhand, Edna. "Final Report: Literacy Technical Assistance Project." Sacramento, Calif.: 1985, (unpublished).

27. "Illiterate America: A Dialogue with Jonathan Kozol." Sacramento: California State Library Foundation, 1985, VHS videotape, 90 min., color.

28. California, Legislature, "Students for Literacy Act," State Assembly, reg. sess., 1985, Bill 718; and *California State Library Newsletter,* no. 58, Oct. 1985, p. 1.

29. Goldberg, Lenny, and Assoc. *Literacy, Employment and the California Economy: A Study and Recommendations for Policy and Program for the California Literacy Campaign*. Oakland, Calif.: Goldberg, Lenny, and Assoc., 1985.

30. California Library Services Board. "Minutes of Meetings: 14, 15, 16 August." [Sacramento, Calif.], 1985, pp. 27-35.

31. California Alliance for Literacy. "Agenda and Accomp. Reports." Los Angeles, 29 Oct. 1985.

32. Strong to California Literacy Campaign Program Coordinators, personal communication, 11 Oct. 1985.

33. California Literacy Campaign. "Statistical Summary," July-Sept. 1985.

34. Dervin, Brenda, and Benson, Fraser. *How Libraries Help*. Stockton, Calif.: University of the Pacific, Dept. of Communication, 1985.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Anatomy of a Technology Transfer: The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Literacy Project

CHRISTINA CARR YOUNG

Introduction

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES and Information Science (NCLIS) is a permanent and independent agency established under Public Law 91-345 on 20 July 1970. Its mandate is to recommend policies and plans to the president and Congress for the provision of library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States. NCLIS is authorized, among other things under the law, to "make and publish such additional reports as it deems to be necessary, including, but not limited to, reports of consultants, transcripts of testimony, summary reports, and reports of other Commission findings, studies, and recommendations."

The programs of the commission are driven by a continual assessment of the library/information needs of the country and in implementing its programs NCLIS plays one of four roles: (1) as *resident expert* in the library/information field to advise the executive and legislative branches of the federal government; (2) as an *honest broker* bringing together representatives of all branches of the government to focus on matters of common interest and to develop recommendations to solve existing problems; (3) providing a *forum* for the library/information community, both public and private sectors, at all levels of government—federal, state, and local; and (4) as a *catalyst* to accelerate change.

Christina Carr Young is Research Associate, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Washington, D.C.

Literacy and NCLIS

The commission has long had an interest in the question of illiteracy in that it is the belief of the commission that illiteracy creates a barrier to access of information. In its program document, *Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action,* this ideal is stated:

> To eventually provide every individual in the United States with equal opportunity of access to that part of the total information resource which will satisfy the individual's educational, working, cultural and leisure-time needs and interests, regardless of the individual's location, social or physical condition or level of intellectual achievement.[1]

Therefore, there is a place for libraries in the schema to raise the reading levels of those persons deemed illiterate in order that they may gain access through the library to the information they need to govern their lives.

In April 1979, as a response to the recurring issue of literacy at state-level governor's conferences prior to the White House Conferences on Library and Information Services, the Theme Conference on Libraries and Literacy was held in Reston, Virginia. Two hundred representatives from the library and educational communities and from government, business, and the private sector met to consider the question of illiteracy and prescribe roles for federal, state, and local governments and libraries to join in the fight against illiteracy. The recommendations from this theme conference were incorporated into the deliberations of the delegates at the 1979 White House Conference on Library and Information Services (WHCLIS) and resulted in Resolution A-4 passed at the conference.[2]

NCLIS and the Department of the Army

In its ongoing process toward implementation of recommendations from WHCLIS, NCLIS staff felt there were research and development projects conducted by the military in the area of reading improvement, and that some of these projects might be suited to a technology transfer that could be utilized by libraries having literacy education programs.

A meeting was requested with E. Jack Kolb, principal technical information officer, U.S. Army Matériel Command Headquarters, for the purpose of seeking assistance in locating suitable projects. Kolb had been a participant in the WHCLIS and was known to have an interest in the area of literacy improvement. He arranged a meeting for NCLIS staff with Donald O. Egner, chief, U.S. Army Human Engineering

Laboratory, to discuss the matter as Egner was currently involved in a reading improvement program with the Baltimore County Department of Education. As a result of the meeting with Egner, a decision was made to establish a steering committee (see appendix) to look at the problem and discuss strategies for accomplishing the task.

Action Steps

Definition of the Problem

The first meeting of the steering committee was 15 June 1983, at which time participants were asked to focus on what can be done by libraries to utilize research and development (R&D) projects developed by the military to increase literacy among adult Americans; briefed on technology transfer and the "Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980" (PL 96-480)[3]; presented with general information on some reading programs developed by the Department of Defense (DOD); and shared background information on literacy and their individual and organizational expertise in the area of literacy improvement.

After much discussion the problem was defined as, "What can be done by sharing and transferring technology developed by the Federal Laboratories Consortium when this technology is to be used by volunteers and others in cooperation with libraries and information facilities to increase literacy among out-of-school teens and adults whose basic skills are between zero and fifth-grade level?"

Problem-Solution Strategy

It was agreed that the group needed more information about projects on "adult learning programs" developed for use by the military and, if possible, demonstrations of the most likely programs for a technology transfer. Egner and Promisel volunteered to continue the search for additional DOD R&D projects. In addition Egner would tap the Federal Laboratories Consortium[4] for recent or in-progress projects. Literature searches were to be performed on the National Technical Information Service and Defense Technical Information Center databases and in *The Network: The Military Educator's Resource.*

The group was aware of numerous commercial packages available, but feedback where these had been used with adults was that the juvenile content "turned off" the students. Therefore the content of any reading program to be considered by the group would have to appeal to the adult learner. The literacy service provider, "Jinx" Crouch, and the literacy librarian, Jane Heiser, agreed to investigate possible sites where the

technology selected might be transferred and to identify potential constraints. NCLIS staff would furnish an independent viewpoint upon examination of the possibilities of the application of technology transfer to the sites.

Information Analysis

The committee reviewed the literature searches and examined the reports from Egner and Promisel on the following adult learning programs developed by federal R&D laboratories:

—Functional Literacy (FLIT)
—Hand-held Vocabulary Tutor
—Language Skills Computer Assisted Instruction (LaSCAI)
—Basic Skill Education Program
—Spatial Data Management System (SDMS)
—Air Force Reading Proficiency Program

The group decided that the most promising prospects were two army programs—Spatial Data Management System and Hand-held Vocabulary Tutor—and the Language Skills Computer-Aided Instruction program developed by the Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, and it requested demonstrations of these. Demonstrations of the three programs revealed the following:

Hand-held Vocabulary Tutor. The hand-held vocabulary tutor was a battery-operated portable device with a liquid-crystal display of thirty-two characters and an abbreviated keyboard. It contains a Texas Instruments basic microprocessor for synthesized speech which is coordinated with an illustrated booklet to train military recruits in the special vocabulary of the Military Occupational Specialty for the Cannon Crewman. The committee felt the device had merit because of its portability and speech capabilities, but overcoming the cost of having a special cartridge developed for the speech synthesis posed a big problem.

Spatial Data Management System. The Spatial Data Management System was an interactive videodisc instructional program to increase basic skills among military recruits. Several modules had been designed to teach (1) navigational and map-using skills, (2) using a table of contents, and (3) test-taking strategies.

The committee agreed the SDMS was excellent for individualized programmed instruction, but the initial cost for creating a videodisc for the purpose of teaching basic reading skills would be prohibitive. Also, the cost and availability of the equipment needed would place the program beyond the reach of the libraries for whom the technology

transfer was intended. Moreover, there could be no adaptation to the SDMS program for the committee's purposes.

Language Skills Computer-Assisted Instruction. LaSCAI was a computer-assisted instruction (CAI) program developed to provide remedial instruction in technical vocabulary and technical reading for navy recruits using content material from navy recruit training manuals. The program performs various exercises on a dictionary of words and a set of related paragraphs to improve and teach: (1) spelling, (2) literal word definitions and usage, (3) sentence structure and content, and (4) comprehension and paragraph flow. LaSCAI was developed for use with the Apple II Plus personal computer but could also be used on a standard Apple IIe. The program had been implemented on the IBM personal computer.

The committee felt that LaSCAI offered the most promise for a technology transfer for the following reasons:

1. The program used the computer to more advantage than the average computer-assisted instruction.
2. The program was designed for a microcomputer that is generally available in public libraries and is within a cost range reasonable for public library application. The program could be modified to run on other microcomputers.
3. The authoring utility permitted the tailoring of instructional material in any content area specific to meeting the needs of targeted groups that would be identified by the tutors and students.
4. The authoring program was available from the Office of Research and Technology Assessment for the U.S. Naval R&D Center.
5. An evaluation of navy personnel using the program revealed a faster learning rate, longer retention rate, and improved literal comprehension skills that exceeded those acquired via a standard classroom approach.
6. Being a CAI program, more students could be handled without increasing a library's staff, number of volunteers, time required, or resources.

The committee then decided that a demonstration project using LaSCAI in a library literacy program would be appropriate in order to test the technology transfer problem.

Site Selection

It was determined that two sites, one urban and one rural, would present the best proving ground because of the varied nature of their

clientele. In order to facilitate monitoring the project it was decided that the sites should be close to Washington, D.C.

The Literacy Resource Center of the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, Maryland volunteered to become the urban site as it had the necessary hardware, a volunteer component already in place, and a ready pool of potential students. The Mary H. Weir Library in Weirton, West Virginia had heard of NCLIS's activities and asked to become the second site. The Weirton Area Literacy Council had received a grant from the Appalachian Regional Council to establish a Community Computer Communication Center for adults and out-of-school youth sixteen years and over residing in the city of Weirton, and in Hancock and Brooke counties. The center would give these persons the opportunity to learn about computers while improving their reading, writing, and computational skills necessary for training and employment. The center was to be based in the library and the library had an ongoing literacy education program.

These two sites appeared to be excellent for demonstration purposes because (1) the literacy tutors at the Baltimore site were trained in the Literacy Volunteers of America technique while those tutors at the Weirton site were trained in the Laubach method. This would permit the use of LaSCAI by persons trained in two differing methodologies of literacy tutoring; (2) the Weirton site, while not close to Washington, D.C., was close to Pittsburgh and the Carnegie-Mellon University where Dr. Thomas Duffy—who played a major role in the project—was based; and (3) Weirton, while not "rural" in the classic sense, was nonmetropolitan.

The Demonstration Project

The project was conducted as an open entry/open exit demonstration rather than a controlled demonstration due to the history of high attrition rates that accompany volunteer literacy programs. The focus of the evaluation of the project was on qualitative methods—i.e., the values that the tutors and students place on the LaSCAI program. For this, the tutors and students would be interviewed before and after the demonstrations to reveal their attitudes toward literacy, tutoring, computers, and the LaSCAI program in general.

The goal of the project was to find the problems that arose as volunteer tutors used LaSCAI with their students and to formulate strategies for dealing with those problems. The project had four phases: (1) review of materials developed for use with LaSCAI; (2) initial interviews of students, tutors, and staff who would be involved; (3) observa-

tion of tutors and students using LaSCAI during the course of the project; and (4) follow-up interviews of all participants.

Workshops were conducted by Thomas Duffy—one of the developers of the LaSCAI program. At each site he introduced the program to staff and volunteers; gave an explanation of the philosophy underlying the program, provided hands-on experience with the program; discussed strategies for developing units of instruction, and gave ways to integrate the CAI with the regular tutoring. The project began at the Baltimore site in October 1984 and ended March 1985. At Weirton, the start date was December 1984, and May 1985 was the ending date.

Development of Materials

Tutors were asked to select one to three content domains having subject matter relevant to daily life and of interest to the students, and the tutors were also asked to submit three units of instructional material to Duffy for editorial feedback. Using the detailed comments and illustrations, materials were revised by the tutors and the final versions submitted to Duffy at Carnegie-Mellon University for programming onto diskettes.

Enoch Pratt Free Library. The librarians at the Baltimore site assumed full responsibility for defining the content domain, identifying relevant materials, and developing units of instruction. Focus was placed on identifying materials that would be of most interest to and meet the needs of the neighborhood. Having substantial experience managing and tutoring in the library's literacy program, the librarians based their judgment on their knowledge of people's requests upon coming to the library for help with particular tasks for which reading is essential. The domains selected for developing materials were "Preparing Your Income Tax Return," "Getting Your Driver's License," and "Consumer Protection."

Mary H. Weir Library. The tutors were given the sole responsibility for determining the content domain, and as each individual tutor was interested in the needs of his or her individual student, this created a problem in the narrow views entertained. There was little agreement as to what the students "should" or would want to read. When asked to focus on a functional topic, the answer was usually too specific—e.g., chicken farming—to have general applicability to a larger audience.

Negotiation resulted in the compromise selection of "Money Management" as the content domain, the rationale being that learning more about money management would be beneficial to all students in that economically depressed section of the country. A later suggestion to

develop materials to parallel the Laubach text being used was enthusiastically received and an additional unit was then developed to accompany Laubach Book 4.

Demographic Data

Tutors. Eleven female and four male tutors took part in the demonstration. They ranged in age from the early twenties to the early seventies with the median age being forty-four years at the Baltimore site and thirty-nine at the Weirton site. All but one tutor had received twelve to sixteen hours of tutor training and had tutored at least one student prior to the start of the demonstration. Four tutors had prior school teaching experience, but none had experience or training in teaching reading.

Students. Five male and ten female students started in the demonstration project. The median age was late twenties. Three students were nonnative speakers of English and they were at the Weirton site.

Students at both sites were given the ABLE reading test—level 1, 2, or 3—to assess their reading ability. The mean grade-level reading score at the urban site was 7.6 and it was 4.1 at the nonmetropolitan site. The median length of previous experience in literacy tutoring was 0.25 months at the urban site and 4.75 at the nonmetropolitan site. Of the students at the urban site 67 percent reported having attended other tutoring or adult education programs. At the nonmetropolitan site 25 percent of the students gave a similar answer.

Student Preinterviews

Seven students at the Baltimore site and eight at the Weirton site were questioned about their experience with and interest in computers; why they wanted to read better; if they felt computers would help them read better; and their views on student-tutor relationships. Students at both sites voiced a limited experience with computers and were interested in learning more about them to help their children who would be using computers in school, and as a possible lead to jobs using computers.

The students' reasons for beginning tutoring differed at the two sites. The Baltimore students stated they felt tutoring in reading would help them improve themselves in a general way, viewing reading as a means of social and economic advancement. The Weirton students' responses were more job-oriented—to help them advance in their present jobs or enable them to read application forms well enough to obtain jobs. All students felt that reading was more than being able to decode words since they experienced trouble understanding what they read

even though they could read the words. Students at both sites voiced the need to read better in order to help or keep up with their children.

The students were unable to imagine what learning to read with a computer would be like having no prior experience. They had reservations that the computer could not give affective answers and would be slower than a tutor in recognizing when a student was experiencing difficulty. The students cited the emotional support and encouragement given by tutors as the most important element in their success in reading.

Tutor Preinterviews

Seven tutors in Baltimore and eight in Weirton were questioned about their attitudes toward computers in society (resistance to change); their ability to integrate computers into their existing routines; and their understanding of LaSCAI and their plans for using it—i.e., separate or integrated with their tutoring, having the student use LaSCAI alone, or under the tutor's guidance. Generally, all of the tutors were accepting and optimistic about computers and the implications of the new technologies for education and for society at large. However, the tutors at Weirton—while citing increased efficiency and more accurate calculations as benefits from computers—also voiced their concern about the dangers of unemployment created by the increasing use of computers.

Most of the tutors felt that LaSCAI would be an entertaining way to introduce new vocabulary and the students would have "fun" using it. They also viewed the project as an introduction to computers.

The tutors at Weirton did not plan to integrate LaSCAI with the Laubach instruction but to use the two in parallel as they did not consider LaSCAI accomplishing the same goals as Laubach instruction. LaSCAI was seen as a motivational tool while the "real" instruction would be via the Laubach skill books. Baltimore planned to start the tutors with new students with LaSCAI being the focus of the instruction; ergo integration into an ongoing student-tutor relationship was not relevant.

All of the tutors except one indicated that they intended to sit beside the student during instruction. The exception opted to leave the student alone after the first session but be accessible during the session for necessary assistance and discussion of the unit at the end of each session.

On-Site Observations

On-site observations were designed to determine if the tutors were able to integrate the LaSCAI program into their tutoring strategies—

i.e., what assistance tutors provided students, what percentage of time the student spent working on-task, and what supplementary material tutors used with the program. The data collected would give evidence if using LaSCAI—or other computer-based literacy programs—would be cost-effective for volunteer tutoring programs.

Only two of the tutors—both having considerable experience teaching on the secondary level, tutoring several adult learners, and familiarity with CAI—left their students to work alone. In general, tutors conducted the computer-based sessions in much the same way as conventional sessions—i.e., sitting beside the student throughout the session, providing information, and answering questions.

Tutors were frequently observed offering students hints about correct answers. In two instances tutors wrote down the definitions and sentences in the LaSCAI exercises in order to prompt the student if the student appeared about to make a mistake. Students spent more time-on-task (working independently) during computer sessions than during conventional tutoring.

Tutor Post-Interviews

Several of the tutors voiced a change in attitude toward and acceptance of computers and CAI as a result of their experience in the project, no longer seeing them as a threat to replace the teacher or the tutor. They viewed the computer as another tool to be used in teaching. Seven of the tutors stated they would like to continue using LaSCAI while two said they "might" continue to use the program if bugs in the current program were eliminated.

Those tutors who had not let their students work alone felt that their students would be able to use LaSCAI on their own. None of the tutors or staff felt LaSCAI alone was a reading course in itself, but they saw it as an effective supplement. They maintained that personal contact was an important component of tutoring.

Four of the urban tutors reported using supplementary materials such as the dictionary, magazines, phonics worksheets, and booklets on content material similar to that on the LaSCAI disks. None of the tutors at the Weirton site reported using any supplementary materials while working with LaSCAI, though they frequently used such material when working with the Laubach books. The majority of tutors at both sites felt that tutors should not develop the instructional units for LaSCAI, but trained staff using suggestions from tutors and students should develop appropriate material. Tutors' suggestions included: having the opportunity to preview material in order to better prepare for the tutoring sessions; including more student writing exercises; needing

more training with LaSCAI before using with students; and providing a larger library of LaSCAI materials with topics of use and interest to students.

Student Post-Interviews

The original participants who were available—including those who were no longer using LaSCAI—were given post-interviews. These included two students at the Baltimore site and four at the rural site.

The students reported feeling quite comfortable working alone at the computer and mentioned some advantages to working alone—e.g., the ability to pace themselves and the feeling of privacy. The students also felt that the program alone was not sufficient to teach reading but was seen as a good supplement to their basic tutoring program.

Implications

The demonstration suggests that the LaSCAI program can be used cost-effectively in volunteer literacy programs that are library based only if it frees tutors and staff to work with new students. Several students could work at the LaSCAI program under minimum supervision by a trained tutor and alternate those sessions with one-on-one tutoring sessions. This strategy would double the number of students with whom a tutor could work.

Students must be allowed to work independently and tutors must be trained to use the program in ways that exploit the potential of the program. When tutors continue to work beside students, LaSCAI is not cost-effective.

Expertise and training in reading instruction are required to identify functional reading requirements and to develop the material for the LaSCAI program. The demonstration suggests that trained staff be responsible for developing materials. The demonstration suggests that tutors are agreeable to the use of CAI as supplemental to the reading program and not as a stand-alone program which it was never intended to be.

LaSCAI should not be viewed as motivational or "fun" thereby becoming a guarantee against attrition. Of the fifteen students who began the project, eight were still in tutoring at the end of the demonstration. Students will continue to drop out of CAI for the same reasons as they drop out of conventional tutoring—personal problems, ill health, family problems, job conflict.

Debugging is a standard requirement in the development of any software. LaSCAI, as used in the demonstration, had been directly

implemented from a research program without support or time for a debugging effort. Before other volunteer programs use LaSCAI it must undergo a debugging. Modifications and additions to the instructional program, as suggested by the tutors, might be accomplished at the same time as the debugging process thereby improving the overall effectiveness of LaSCAI.

Conclusions

1. The LaSCAI program developed by the Naval Personnel Research and Development Center can be used to advantage in a library setting utilizing volunteer tutors to increase the reading and comprehension levels of adult students.
2. Additional program modification and documentation is needed in order to extend the use of LaSCAI, without extensive personnel backup, to other libraries.
3. A single location is essential to administer the application of this program for other libraries, to serve as a clearinghouse for new materials developed, and to obtain resources to direct continuing R&D needed to improve and expand the utilization of the program.

Afterword

Extension of the project to the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania area is under consideration. A cooperative proposal for a "Computer-Based Adult Literacy Instruction Program" drafted by the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, the Carnegie-Mellon University, the University of Pittsburgh, and the Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council, calls for the development of a "magnet" literacy center to serve as a research and development site as well as a feeder point for delivery of services to four targeted library branches.

References

1. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action.* Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1975, p. xi.

2. White House Conference on Library and Information Services. *The Final Report: Information for the 1980's.* Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1979, pp. 46-47.

3. The Act states: "it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure the full use of the results of the Nation's Federal Investment in research and development. To this end the Federal Government shall strive where appropriate to

transfer federally owned or originated technology to State and Local governments and to the private sector." U.S. Congress, House Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Science and Technology. "Stevenson Technology Innovation Act of 1980." 96th Cong., 2d sess., rept. no. 7, 96-1199.

4. The Federal Laboratories Consortium (for Technology Transfer) is composed of members from over 200 R&D laboratories and centers from 11 federal agencies. The consortium promotes communication between DOD laboratories and other agencies and maximizes opportunities for finding new and multiple applications for available and developing technologies.

Appendix

STEERING COMMITTEE

Helen, (Jinx) Crouch, Executive Director, Literacy Volunteers of America, Syracuse, New York.
June Eiselstein, Director, Mary H. Weir Public Library, Weirton, West Virginia.
Jane Heiser, Director, Literacy Resource Center, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland.
David Promisel, U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, Washington, D.C.
Charlotte Purnell/John Painter, Delaware Technical and Community College, Georgetown, Delaware.
Donald O. Egner, Chief, U.S. Army Human Engineering Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.
Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar, NCLIS.
Christina Carr Young, NCLIS.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Literacy Projects in Libraries

KAREN K. GAUGHAN

LITERACY VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA (LVA) is a nonprofit educational organization founded in 1962 to train volunteer tutors to teach adults and teens to read, write, and speak English. From the initial realization in 1960 that 11,000 adults in her own central New York community were functionally illiterate, LVA founder Ruth Colvin convinced enough local leaders that the problem needed addressing. Church Women United of Syracuse responded to Ruth's plea, placing her in charge of organizing a local volunteer response.

From this grassroots origin grew a national volunteer organization dedicated to helping that hidden segment of America's population who could not read and therefore were restricted from full participation in the social system. Once the public was made aware of the illiteracy problem that handicaps so many of its citizens, community recruitment of volunteer tutors came easily. Programs sprang up everywhere, first in New York State then in Maine. In 1972 a federal grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funded the initiation of programs in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York City. Isolated LVA affiliates were begun in Illinois, Vermont, and New Jersey.

In 1985 LVA had 220 programs in thirty states and was expanding by nearly 30 percent each year. It became evident early on that for these LVA programs to continue and flourish after the Syracuse training team moved on, a volunteer program management system had to be developed. The resulting guidelines address the need for board development

Karen K. Gaughan is Coordinator, Public Relations, Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc., Syracuse, New York.

and management of each affiliate and incorporates a step-by-step process for successfully running a local LVA program. LVA is as well known for its volunteer program management system as it is for its contribution to literacy. Another hallmark of LVA's approach has been the continuous research and development of training materials to help the volunteer tutor, trainer, and program manager.

While thousands of individuals responded to the call for assisting the adult nonreader, convincing the established world—public schools, government, libraries, and business—was largely not forthcoming in the 1960s. Such lack of concern restricted the potential impact of LVA and other volunteer groups in their efforts to address the illiteracy issue. The establishment had the clout, the access to public attention, and the funds to make changes. Volunteers had conviction and dedication—they made changes in many individual lives, but illiteracy continued to increase at a startling rate.

It is hoped that all that is about to change! The "world" has awakened to the "crisis" of functional illiteracy. Adult Performance Level (APL) studies conducted by the University of Texas and publicized by David Harman and Carman St. John Hunter[1] provided the credibility and ammunition needed to convince government leaders, librarians, educators, and business leaders that widespread illiteracy adversely affected the social and economic well-being of America.

While several movements were simultaneously emerging to bring illiteracy to public focus, a turning point occurred with the American Library Association's decision to prioritize the active role of libraries in the eradication of illiteracy. In 1977 Helen Lyman wrote *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries*[2] which contained a wealth of information on adult illiteracy and comprehensive guidelines for librarians to use in initiating and supporting literacy programs. In 1979 the American Library Association, funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., conducted three workshops to train librarians in the techniques of establishing programs to teach basic literacy skills to functionally illiterate adults. The ripple effect of these workshops has been positive. Eight hundred and sixty-two additional librarians from around the country were trained to initiate literacy programs or increase cooperation with existing literacy projects. Within two years library-sponsored LVA affiliates increased 35 percent as a result of the ALA training. Libraries were becoming ideal partners for local LVA efforts. Many local LVA affiliates were finding homes in library locations.

In 1981 the American Library Association spearheaded the formation of the Coalition for Literacy calling together representatives of eleven educational, government, business, volunteer, and professional

organizations. The results of the coalition's efforts are currently making history in focusing attention on the issue of functional illiteracy in America. The coalition's goal was to develop a strong national thrust that would generate public awareness of the literacy challenge and develop a mechanism to mobilize and channel the necessary resources to local community-based programs. The resulting national multimedia ad campaign and the CONTACT 800 referral number concentrate on recruiting volunteer resources and stimulating corporate involvement. The impact of the media campaign has been most rewarding, especially to local literacy groups that have been struggling for years to address the problem.

As a result of ALA's national role in literacy service, several state library departments and associations have adopted a similar proactive position on adult basic skills service. In turn, local libraries are responding to this bilevel mandate by assessing and activating an appropriate role for themselves in their community literacy effort. Such library efforts are emerging in a variety of formats and levels of cooperation with existing programs ranging from minimal to full participation.

In a 1984 national survey of LVA affiliates, program directors were asked to identify services provided by their community library in support of literacy services to the public. Responses were received from 107 affiliates—representing 58 percent of all LVA programs. Virtually all affiliates in New York State and Connecticut (the states with strongest LVA representation) replied to the survey, providing an excellent overview of the extent and kinds of library participation in LVA programs.

New York State

In 1984 the New York State (NYS) Board of Regents adopted a plan to develop community-based literacy programs for adults and young adults statewide through public libraries by 1988. New York has nearly $200,000 in Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) funds invested in eight literacy projects within library systems.

Literacy Volunteers of America programs throughout NYS are benefiting from the commitment. The survey of NYS reveals that all forty-seven LVA affiliates receive support from their local library or library system. Over fifty (at least one in each of the twenty-two public library systems) provide services, materials, or programs to help LVA train tutors and recruit students.

Services most commonly offered by NYS libraries to LVA programs include tutoring and training space and high interest/low level reading

collections for tutors to use with students. Libraries assist in the publicity efforts of twenty-two LVA programs and twelve affiliates are provided part-time program coordinators by libraries usually through LSCA funds. Other kinds of support include use of telephone, duplicating services, office equipment, and advocacy and awareness efforts.

The NYS Library has also promoted a statewide network of library-based literacy referral centers. With the growing awareness of the illiteracy issue it becomes more essential than ever to ease the system of responding to citizen inquiries. Library staffs across the state are being encouraged to find which agencies in their community best serve various adult learning needs in order to refer student callers to the appropriate service provider. Callers interested in volunteering are referred to LVA or other volunteer literacy programs within the community. Literacy Volunteers of New York State encourages local affiliates who promote their services in overlapping marketing areas to include the message, "Call your local library," in media public service announcements.

SELECTED PROFILES OF LVA/LITERACY PROJECTS IN NEW YORK STATE

Program Name—*Literacy Volunteers of America-Westchester County, Inc.* A collaboration of eight previously autonomous affiliates located in an affluent suburb of New York City, coordinated by the Westchester Library system.

Contact Person: Margaret Dean, exective director. Support staff: part-time workshop coordinator and administrative assistant.

Date Founded: 1983.

Location: Westchester Community College, Valhalla, New York.

Program Service Area: Westchester County, New York. Total population 866,600. An estimated 128,000 adults over eighteen need basic skills instruction. Special targets: nonreading adults in 0-5 grade-level range and non-English-speaking adults.

Program Focus: To provide free basic reading and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) tutoring on a one-to-one basis to functionally illiterate adults and non-English-speaking adults through trained volunteers. The LVA Westchester affiliate also has a strong peer tutoring project in Sing Sing Correctional facility.

Training Activities: Ten basic reading and English-as-a-second-language workshops per year yielding 150 new tutors. Six in-service training sessions for experienced tutors. On-going sensitivity training for library personnel.

Numbers Served: Approximately 450 volunteers tutoring the same number of students.

Budget Information: LSCA provides $25,000 for executive director's salary and benefits. Forty-six thousand dollars is derived from private funding: corporations, foundations, individuals. Westchester Library System provides tutoring space and materials in most of its thirty-eight member libraries.

Summary of Library Support: Materials—i.e., high interest/low level reading collection—referral, space for training and tutoring, copying, telephone, Friends of library financial support, and an LSCA grant for director's salary.

Evaluation: LVA—Westchester County, one of the largest LVA affiliates in the country, attributes much of its success to the support of the thirty-eight member libraries that provide a friendly, open-door policy to both tutors and students. The Westchester Library System Board of Directors voted literacy as the number one priority to be addressed by member libraries in the 1980s.

Problems: Librarians are still not as informed as they should be. Overworked staff and the influx of new librarians need continuous updating and sensitizing to the needs of nonreading and low-level reading adults. Program funding is insecure under present LSCA grant arrangements.

Program Name—*Brooklyn Public Library Literacy Program.*

Contact Person: Jeanne Cowen, coordinator. Support Staff: fourteen full-time; twelve part-time professional and clerical staff in five learning centers.

Date Founded: 1975 through Literacy Volunteers of America.

Location: Brooklyn Public Library, Central Library, Grand Army Plaza, Brooklyn.

Program Service Area: Borough of Brooklyn, New York.

Program Focus: To provide free basic reading instruction to 0-5 grade-level readers, on a one-to-one tutoring basis or in small-group settings.

To provide on-site conversational English class instruction through the NYC Adult Basic Education (ABE) program. To encourage computer-assisted literacy instruction to interested students. Brooklyn Library reading centers make sixteen computers available to basic skills students. Through extensive outreach with community agencies the Brooklyn Public Library Literacy Program specifically targets high school dropouts and unemployed youth.

Training Activities: Conduct nine to twelve basic reading workshops per year, yielding approximately 250-300 volunteer tutors; and conduct several in-service training sessions for experienced tutors. Sensitivity training for library staff and the public is conducted continuously.

Number Served: Approximately 400 volunteers; 500-600 basic reading students, 200-300 ESL students receiving ABE instruction.

Budget Information: New York City's Municipal Assistance Corporation (MAC) totally finances this program at $600,000 annually (through 1987), as a pilot literacy project. Brooklyn Public Library provides training, tutoring space, and classrooms for ESL instructors as well as materials.

Summary of Library Support: The Brooklyn Public Library Reading Project is a fully library-sponsored program, governed by library administrators and library board of trustees. The project consists of five major learning centers involving eighteen library branches. Extensive high interest/low level reading instructional support materials are made available through all branches. The library also makes computers and cassettes available to both tutors and students for skills practice and reinforcement.

The Brooklyn Public Library Literacy Project is among the first volunteer literacy programs to develop a student council allowing students a voice in the program services and the opportunity to establish a mutual support system. Participation in the student council went from seven to sixty-nine students in the first year. Student retention in the literacy program has increased significantly since initiation of the student council and program staff and tutors feel they have a better insight to special student problems and needs.

Evaluation: This program is a rare example of a totally library-subsidized volunteer literacy program. The library's allocation of over twenty staff dedicated to literacy services enables the program to be innovative in its approach to recruitment, training, and student retention. In some instances students have progressed to become part-time employees of the literacy program.

Problems: When city funding ceases in 1987, Brooklyn Public Library is expected to assume the financial burden of the program, or find alternative funding. There is concern that the current high quality of literacy services will be curtailed if funding is drastically reduced.

Other Literacy Volunteer Programs

The Onondaga County Public Library is working with Literacy Volunteers of America, Literacy Volunteers of Greater Syracuse, Laubach Literacy, the Adult Basic Learning Center, and all other local literacy providers to promote literacy programs in the Syracuse area on radio and television and through brochures and fliers. A project assistant provides information and support for students and tutors and instructs inmates weekly at a local correctional facility. In addition to special collections of new reader materials, the Borg-Warner System 80, an audiovisual teaching machine, is available at sixteen libraries and provides individualized learning experiences for over 3000 patrons. Onondaga County Public Library also compiled a directory containing referral information on local literacy and adult education programs. Contact: Jane Cathcart, extension services librarian, Onondaga County Public Library, Syracuse, New York.

Chemung-Southern Tier Library System used $25,000 in LSCA monies to support a literacy volunteer program in cooperation with Literacy Volunteers of the Central Southern Tier. The system hired a director for the literacy program and established the program at the Corning Public Library. In addition to training, tutoring, and support services, the program also emphasizes the development of personal computer programs to assist tutors and students. Five libraries use microcomputers and specially designed teaching programs and teacher's guides. Contact: Kim Spencer, director, LV of the Central Southern Tier, Corning Public Library, Corning, New York.

The Mid-York Library System cooperates with the Literacy Volunteers of the Mohawk Valley in using computer technology for tutoring. The system acquired an Apple IIe computer provided by LSCA funds. Mid-York has sponsored a literacy project for over eight years and provides space, clerical assistance, professional liaison, and public relations assistance. From July 1984 through June 1985 eighty-eight volunteers provided 6000 hours of tutoring and support help for ninety students. Contact: Esther Bendik, coordinator, LV-Mohawk Valley, Mid-York Library System, Utica, New York.

Connecticut

LVA affiliates in Connecticut report similar library support of their literacy efforts. Nine of the eighteen affiliates are headquartered in libraries and granted free use of library equipment, telephones, and outreach services. Seventeen of the affiliates are provided tutoring space within libraries and fifteen use library facilities for tutor training and in-service workshops. Most of the affiliates include library representatives on their boards.

All the libraries incorporate high interest/low level reading materials in their collections. In 1984 the Connecticut State Library granted $1000 to each of the public libraries in the eighteen Connecticut communities with LVA affiliates for the purchase of literacy materials.

LSCA grants funded the start-up of two Connecticut LVA programs ten years ago. After the initial two years the affiliates became financially independent while retaining the library location for their programs.

Over the years libraries have generously allocated LSCA funds to literacy-related needs—e.g., materials, sponsorship of LVA tutor training workshops. In 1985 the Connecticut State Library earmarked an extra $15,000 of LSCA money for literacy. LVA affiliates applied for and received much of this allocation for their program support.

Governor William O'Neil recently announced a statewide Coalition for Literacy in Connecticut calling for the joint efforts of the State Library, Department of Education, and Literacy Volunteers of Connecticut to increase the public's awareness of illiteracy and arouse more private and public resources for literacy efforts.

According to Julia Stone, director of LV—Connecticut, the LVA/library liaison is the most sensible approach to the volunteer literacy movement. Libraries are often community centers dedicated to free access and information. LVA programs benefit greatly from the specialized materials and professional referral services that librarians provide. The many in-kind services provided by libraries take some of the pressure off volunteers to raise the dollars needed for program operation.

Libraries benefit from the LVA connection by acquiring new readers as regular patrons and by enabling libraries to fulfill their primary institutional role: serving the whole public in acquiring informational and life-long knowledge.

California

The California Literacy Campaign was developed in 1983 to involve libraries in a grassroots effort to increase adult literacy in their

communities. The California State Library made a major commitment of $2,515,000 in LSCA awards to twenty-seven libraries in 1984. An equal amount was granted from state funds giving the campaign leadership potential among statewide literacy efforts.

The California Literacy Campaign has been accompanied by a highly visible promotional effort to sensitize the public to the debilitating effect of illiteracy on the individual who cannot participate fully in society, and the effect on the community. The campaign deliberately targets a local response to a defined illiteracy problem within communities. The call for volunteers is a primary focus while involved libraries are encouraged to develop working relationships with public service agencies, schools, colleges, and service organizations in order to share resources, referrals, and responsibilities. Such coordination did not generally exist prior to the literacy campaign. It is hoped that such collaboration of existing services and the enlistment of volunteers will make appreciable impact on local illiteracy statistics.

Over 100 communities are being served by library campaign-funded literacy programs. In several instances Literacy Volunteers of America tutor-training was selected as the core training for these projects.

PROFILES

Program Name—*Literacy Volunteers of America, Imperial Valley, California.*

Contact Person: Lyvier Conss, executive director. Support Staff: two college student assistants.

Date Founded: 1984.

Location: Imperial County Free Library, El Centro, California.

Program Service Area: Imperial County (4000 square miles, primarily agricultural and rural and encompassing twelve towns). Population: 100,000—an estimated 20,000 over eighteen need basic reading instruction.

Program Focus: To make a significant impact on the functional illiteracy problem affecting 20,000 adults in Imperial Valley. Specializes in one-to-one tutoring in basic reading to adults with 0-5 grade-level reading skills. Migrant farm workers are a special focus group.

Training Activities: Basic Reading Tutor Training Workshops—twelve per year. Outreach training at the local community college. In-service tutor training—five per year. Mini-seminars to sensitize library staff to adult new reader needs.

Numbers Served: Fifty-eight tutors and sixty-one students (1985).

Budget Information: The California Literacy Campaign funds the executive director position; library provides the office and equipment and tutoring and training space. Community-awareness events raise some funds that are used for paid publicity.

Summary of Library Support: Site library collaborates with other libraries: Brawley, El Centro, and seven branches, as well as social service agencies, and the Migrant Workers Association to reach as many volunteers and students as possible. Librarians have been most cooperative in providing coping skills materials to the program.

Evaluation: This LVA/Library project stands as a successful model of the California Literacy Campaign effort. Publicity accompanying the statewide campaign encourages librarians to become fully involved and open their doors to serve the adult new reader.

Problem: Concern that when the state campaign ends, the already pinched library budgets will not be able to assume the extra burden of specialized literacy projects. The project also sees a continuous need to recruit and retain more volunteer tutors.

Program Name—*Literacy Volunteers of Bay County, Florida.*

Contact Person: Sandra Pierce, volunteer coordinator. Supported by part-time library assistant.

Date Founded: 1981.

Location: Bay County Public Library, Panama City, Florida.

Program Service Area: Bay, Calhoun, Gulf, Holmes, and Washington Counties, Florida. Approximately 40,000 adults over eighteen with less than nine years education.

Program Focus: To fight illiteracy in conjunction with other professionals through the use of trained volunteers. This is the only program in the Bay County area offering one-to-one tutoring to 0-5 grade-level readers.

Training Activities: Four annual basic reading tutor-training workshops. Tutor in service, two per year. Awareness workshops to inform library staff of students' needs.

Budget Information: LSCA funds the volunteer coordinator's salary. The library funds the assistant's position, provides office space, telephone, copier, equipment, and tutoring/workshop space. Some community fund-raising is conducted by LV-Bay County.

Summary of Library Support: Library actually subsidizes this LVA program. Collaboration with fourteen branch libraries in a six-county area and other adult education programs and social service agencies provides effective outreach potential. The library-provided high interest/low level reading collection is an asset to tutor and students.

Evaluation: Coordinator feels this LVA affiliate works best in the library because the library network provides an identifiable structure to draw both tutors and students in this diverse and rural geographic area.

Future Needs: To devise better methods of servicing the hard-to-reach nonreader.

Program Name—*Literacy Volunteers, Southbridge, Massachusetts.*

Contact Person: Joanne Hammerly, executive director.

Date Founded: 1975 through LSCA funding.

Location: Jacob Edwards Library, Southbridge, Massachusetts.

Program Service Area: Three-town are of Southbridge, Sturbridge, Charlton, 30,000 (total population); approximately 3000 nonreading or non-English-speaking adults. Special targets: Approximately 1100 Hispanic and Southeast Asian population.

Program Focus: To respond to the community's mandate to upgrade adult basic skills service with particular emphasis on offering conversational English skills to the foreign born. This LVA program serves mostly ESL students.

Training Activities: Four annual basic reading and ESL tutor-training workshops. In-service training for tutors, two per year, including special interest subjects—e.g., learning disabilities and computer-assisted literacy.

Numbers Served: Seventy-two volunteers serving ninety-two students.

Budget Information: United Way funds director's salary; local foundations and corporations fund operating expenses and special events. Library provides office/tutoring/training space and staff assistance.

Summary of Library Support: Excellent board of trustees support; library director serves as program treasurer and fiscal agent. Entire staff

in tune with the program and helpful in providing materials needed by tutors and students.

Evaluation: The library is the central community focus for adult basic skills help. Besides in-kind space and materials support, the library used an LSCA grant to fund a special computer assisted literacy service for LVA tutors and students. The library setting helps ensure student retention and continued growth in reading skills. The library in turn receives excellent public relations from the literacy program, as well as a continuous influx of new library users.

Future Needs: An even more committed attitude and additional financial resources to allocate more staff hours to the literacy project. Continuous need to increase the number of volunteers.

Conclusion

A volunteer's commitment to teach an adult to read has frequently changed an individual's life. That student is affirmed—sometimes for the first time in his life—by the realization that another person cares enough to invest in him and by the success in his own reading. The student's commitment to basic skills learning is also a life changing process. As learning increases, the individual is empowered to act in society on his own behalf.

A library's commitment to serve the functionally illiterate population also involves the commitment to change. Libraries offering the just-described support to volunteer literacy programs run the risk of self-complacency. Libraries feel justly proud of meeting ALA's goals of delivering user-oriented library and informational services to all. Library administrators also pride themselves on being alternative learning centers for the independent learners by providing the means of continuing education to patrons of all needs and capacities.

In conducting this survey of literacy projects in libraries, a recurring theme from project directors was the perception of the library as a community center—the hub of local learning. Such a nonthreatening, open-door approach makes the library a natural setting for a literacy program. Literacy programs within libraries have the additional advantage of benefiting from immediate access to professionals who can gather, identify, and recommend materials to help tutors and students. There is no argument about the important role libraries play in literacy service. There is room for improvement, however. In fact, to affect appreciable reversals in national illiteracy statistics there is a mandate for change in some library attitudes and approaches.

For American libraries to become a major vehicle in the eradication of illiteracy, a commitment beyond physical space, a percentage of time of already overworked librarians and in-kind resources is urgently needed. Substantial resources, human and financial, must be allocated to basic skills service—similar to library budgets earmarked for art and music, services to the handicapped, or audiovisual services. A library staff person dedicated to needs assessment, referring and reaching out to the new or nonreader as well as coordinating adult basic skills materials, would commit a library to a much more progressive role in literacy service. Volunteer coordinators would still handle tutor recruitment, training, and technical assistance but would benefit from a continual referral of students.

Library administrators must objectively evaluate any physical or perceived institutional barrier to the lowest level readers within their community. Libraries *can* be community centers, but do they draw the functional illiterate who has already experienced institutional failure in schools or workplaces? Efforts must be made to eliminate as many of these barriers as possible. Collaboration with outside social service agencies will help identify clientele. Making them library users is the next challenge.

The library open-door policy to independent learners is commendable. Functionally illiterate adults, however, are not independent learners. Adults in literacy programs aspire to be self-reliant, but literacy students typically demonstrate a myriad of needs of which reading is only a part. Frequently there are financial, health, legal, child care, or even marital problems that must be addressed before or along with the basic skills needs. Librarians in tune with these potential problems of their clientele and knowledgeable of the community's social service agencies can offer immeasurable assistance to the adult new reader. Independent learning can only take place when basic needs are met.

Beyond identifying and collecting high interest/low level materials for new readers, librarians can undertake production of materials that address special needs. For example, directories of social agencies along with their services could be rewritten and accessibly produced for low-level readers' comprehension.

Libraries could further enrich volunteer literacy programs by lending professional expertise in many management or technical areas such as fiscal management, public relations, and board development. The most successful programs continuously seek new human resources who can contribute to the affiliate with renewed spirit and fresh insight. Librarians can help affiliates identify the movers and shakers in the community.

Progressive libraries frequently offer social or informational programs to patrons with special interests—e.g., film clubs, opera previews, book reviews. Making these programs available to new or low-level readers could be most rewarding for all concerned. Other possibilities are limitless: a student organization that could help librarians and tutors better identify needs and wants; guest speakers from health, ABE, business, or employment agencies; and literacy-based computer instructions.

A final suggestion for librarians is to stay in tune with the most advanced materials and user-friendly equipment for adult learning—e.g., computer, audiovisual, video. Investigation and commitment to provide such technology can help maintain new students' interest and help gain the library a long-term user.

The increasing library involvement with LVA programs has had a most positive effect on expanding literacy services in many communities. Yet, the potential for even greater library commitment remains almost open-ended. Involved librarians should share in the pride of helping to change the lives of many new readers and library patrons. Charles Mobley, a student from Brooklyn Public Library's reading program, participated in LVA's 1985 national conference. His comments on the experience provide inspiration to all literacy service providers: "It made me feel proud, not ashamed to express my feeling about belonging to this program. I have learned a lot and do not feel alone as I look around me. I encourage others like me to join because I know it will make a change in our future for better."

References

1. Hunter, Carman St. John, and Harman, David. *Adult Illiteracy in the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

2. Lyman, Helen Huguenor. *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries.* Chicago: ALA, 1977.

Additional References

American Library Association, Office of Library Outreach Services. *Libraries and Literacy.* Chicago: ALA, undated.

Curry, Anna. "Adult Learner Services at the Pratt Library: An Evaluative Treatment." *Library Trends* 31(Spring 1983):585-97.

Heiser, Jane C., ed. "The Public Library in the Coalition Against Illiteracy." *Public Libraries* 23(Winter 1984):107-23.

Josey, E.J., ed. "Outreach Library Services." *The Bookmark* (New York State Library) 43(Winter 1985):55-100.

_____. "A *PW* Special Report: The Illiteracy Blight." *Publisher's Weekly* 227(24 May 1985):27-48.

Monroe, Margaret E. *Library Adult Education: The Biography of an Idea.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1963.

New York State Library. "Information for Educators, Librarians, Community Groups and Others Working Together to Fight Illiteracy in New York State: 1984 Annual Report." Albany, N.Y.: NYSL, 1984.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Dyslexics as Library Users

BARBARA A. BLISS

A DYSLEXIC IS A PERSON of average intelligence or better who has difficulty learning to read and/or spell. Sometimes this involves remembering how to pronounce words correctly and thus affects speech, but often the dyslexic is able to speak adequately. Until old enough to go to school, the potential dyslexic is often quite normal in development. Speech may be slower to develop and memory for sequential commands may be short, but in most ways the person is very much like others of the same age...until he or she fails to learn basic skills in school.[1]

Those of us who have learned to read and spell with little effort find it very difficult to understand why the dyslexic cannot learn in the same way. The first thought that comes to mind is that the dyslexic is not very "bright." When this does not seem to fit because the dyslexic is gifted in another area such as mathematics or mechanics, then the reason appears to be that he/she is "not trying" or is "lazy." Other common notions center on the psychological: there must be an "emotional block" due to problems within the family, a demanding mother, a domineering father, a divorce, or the death of a loved one.

Research Efforts

Unfortunately these myths and erroneous diagnoses persist in spite of the fact that in 1925 Dr. Samuel T. Orton provided a physiological

Barbara A. Bliss is an instructor, General Studies Department, Madison Area Technical College, Madison, Wisconsin and since retirement has worked with adult dyslexics as a counselor and Orton-Gillingham tutor.

reason for dyslexia. A bright, sixteen-year-old boy, reading at the first-grade level, became his first dyslexic patient.

Orton was a neurologist and psychiatrist at the Iowa Psychopathic Hospital. His training and experience with stroke patients who suffered language loss through injury to one side of the brain gave him a useful insight into language development. His belief in a physical basis for reading problems differed from the popular psychological theories of his day which leaned toward the emotional causation of school problems. Orton acknowledged that often there were emotional problems but that they were reactions to the frustrations of failure and defeat brought about by the primary cause—dyslexia. A grant from the Rockefeller Foundation enabled him to set up a research program first at the State University of Iowa, and then at Columbia University in New York City. He also directed other research projects in Connecticut and Pennsylvania during World War II.[2]

What was once considered merely a theory based on careful observation has recently proved to be correct. At the Beth Israel Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts, brain research has revealed specific differences between the structure of the brain of a dyslexic and that of persons without language deficits.[3] Dyslexics have trouble with words because their brains are formed differently in the areas most involved with language.

When Orton died in 1948, a group of his associates formed an Orton Society to keep in touch and to carry on his research into dyslexia. Membership was multidisciplinary and dedicated. Each year a professional journal, *The Bulletin of the Orton Dyslexia Society,* was published with articles on dyslexia. International meetings and conferences were held bringing together people interested in the phenomenon from all over the world. European and British researchers began to contribute to the journal. (In 1982 the name of the organization was changed to the Orton Dyslexia Society and the journal to *Annals of Dyslexia.*)

Strangely enough, paralleling this but showing very little interest in it was educational research by the International Reading Association made up primarily of reading teachers and those who trained them. The gulf between the organizations probably stemmed from the controversy over which was better, the phonic approach or the whole-word approach.[4]

In retrospect it seems now that probably 80 percent of the population is able to learn to read reasonably well by the whole-word approach, but many of these individuals experience difficulty with spelling because their visual memory for words is weak, and they do not know the sounds of letters and combinations of letters to use as a backup

system when they cannot "see" how the word looks in order to spell it correctly.

What of the remaining 20 percent, the nonreaders? They fail in school: not once, but over and over again. This unexplained reading failure in otherwise capable students undermines self-confidence, causes unnecessary punishment and ridicule, and prevents learning by reading. Holding a child back to repeat a grade does not help if the method of instruction remains the same. Orton, with his neurological background and wide experience with dyslexics, together with Anna Gillingham, a psychologist and educator, devised a system of teaching phonics consistent with neurological understandings of the ways people learn. The Orton-Gillingham approach[5] utilizes a multisensory, sequential, systematic approach, with frequent drill, identification of sounds of letters, and application of generalizations regarding spelling and reading the English language. Over many years, dedicated and innovative teachers have refined and adapted the approach into a highly successful technique for teaching encoding and decoding.

Libraries and the Dyslexic

In order for libraries to reach this special population of handicapped learners, perhaps we should ask a number of questions.

—How much information does the library have on dyslexia? The Orton Dyslexia Society? The Orton-Gillingham approach?

—What materials are available for teachers, tutors, or parents to use in helping dyslexics learn to spell or read? Are these materials primarily visually oriented? If so, they may cause the dyslexic to experience yet another failure. The dyslexic can learn with a multisensory, sequential approach, individualized for his or her special needs.

—Is there a list available of tutors and teachers in the area trained in the Orton-Gillingham approach?

—Does the library publicize workshops for teachers interested in helping dyslexics learn to read? There are many potential library users among handicapped readers.

—Are taped articles about dyslexia available for adults to read and listen to? Imagine what it must be like to be diagnosed as "dyslexic" and not to know what this means, what can be done (if anything), and where to go for help.

—Does the library collect large-print books for dyslexics as well as for the sight impaired? It makes reading much less arduous.

—Are there some exciting books taped and packaged with a print copy?

When dyslexics read along with a recording, the experience is pleasurable rather than frustrating, and comprehension is greatly improved. While some are able to read as though they were translating a foreign language, there is no pleasure for them in reading—only pain, fatigue, and great embarrassment. How reassuring it would be to read and listen to one of the interesting autobiographies by a dyslexic (see additional references).

A Classroom of Adult Dyslexics

For several years the author has been teaching a course for adult dyslexics at the Madison Area Technical College. The five-week course, "Living With Dyslexia," stresses receiving accurate information about the disability; learning coping skills for daily living; developing assets and abilities; improving basic skills of reading and spelling; learning to communicate with the boss, a professor, spouse, or children about one's disability; and helping other dyslexics.

The course is taught without a textbook, quizzes, or exams, or written papers. Students are urged to tape-record the lessons and listen as many times as necessary before the next class. Research articles are recorded and, together with a print copy, packaged in a manila envelope for students to borrow between classes. Articles vary in difficulty from newspaper and popular magazine articles to recent research found in current multidisciplinary journals. In this way the dyslexic student has access to complete data not just what the instructor deems important.

Dyslexics are like persons who are starving: they may know there is food available, but they are unable to obtain it. They know books contain information and ideas which they need and desire, but their inadequate reading skills keep them from getting it. Sometimes their first successful experience with reading occurs when they follow a script while listening to a tape recording of information on dyslexia. The librarian who makes audio-reading available to nonreaders is unlocking the contents of books for one-fifth of the population.

The Adult Dyslexic

What has the instructor learned from listening to the dyslexic members of his classes that might interest librarians?

1. Most often expressed by individuals is the relief dyslexics feel when they meet others like themselves. No longer do they feel like freaks, loners.

2. Dyslexics are eager to learn but are afraid to try because of repeated failure experiences.
3. They can operate AV equipment with ease *unless given written instructions.*
4. They remember verbal instructions when not too many are given at one time. (If instructions are too lengthy, a tape recorder should be used so the dyslexic can listen more than once or stop the machine at intervals while responding. Better still would be to *demonstrate* the process because dyslexics usually learn best this way.)
5. A card catalog is very confusing to dyslexics, but they are very appreciative when librarians understand their plight and take the time to assist them.
6. Many dyslexics have learned to use the word processor and it has freed them from embarrassment of depending on others to write letters for them or check their spelling. However, owning a computer and printer is beyond the financial capability of many who are underemployed due to their dyslexia. Reading the instruction manuals seems next to impossible, but they are capable of learning through active participation. Word processors should be made available and demonstrations provided (preferably by another dyslexic).
7. Dyslexia is an invisible handicap. One cannot tell a dyslexic from a good reader by sight, and many are too embarrassed to admit to their problem because people still equate being unable to read, spell, and write with mental retardation.
8. Dyslexics are eligible for Talking Books for the Blind, but consider what it must be like to be required to ask a physician (who may know very little about dyslexia) for a signature on an application for services. The doubt and suspicion which implies that the dyslexic individual is trying to put something over on the public or else is too lazy to read is painful to endure. Dyslexics often suffer one such embarrassment after another all day long because people do not understand.
9. Dyslexics want to learn to read and spell adequately. They hate to be handicapped and excluded from what others are able to do. A surprising number of them keep trying (and failing) over and over again. Too many others give up. Research indicates a strong relation between school failure and delinquency.[6] It is painful to remember that between 70 and 80 percent of federal prisoners are functionally illiterate.
10. One common reason why dyslexics seek help with reading and spelling is because they cannot read to their small children or help them with their homework.

A Library Response

Now libraries are beginning to respond to the needs of this special nonreading population. The question is: Will those library personnel who have no problem reading and spelling offer the same solutions that have failed the dyslexic in the past? Let us hope not. New answers must be found based on what has worked. One way to ensure this is to cooperate with other agencies and organizations that are searching for alternative approaches.

In a valiant attempt to find alternatives, the Dane County (Wisconsin) Library System in July 1984 entered into a contractual agreement with the Madison (Wisconsin) Literacy Council to open Literacy Outreach Centers in four libraries in Dane County, outside Madison, Wisconsin. The libraries chosen were Middleton, Verona, Stoughton, and Sun Prairie. An application for an LSCA grant was made and obtained through the Department of Public Instruction of the State of Wisconsin. Mention was made in the grant of the importance of recognizing and serving dyslexic adults.

Three main forces and developments in the community converged to bring about this program: (1) the Madison Literacy Council (MLC), (2) the Wisconsin Branch of the Orton Dyslexia Society, and (3) Madison Area Technical College. On the Board of Directors of the Madison Literacy Council were people of diverse backgrounds deeply concerned with literacy. Two of these were librarians acquainted with the Library Services and Construction Act, which focused on the need for libraries to reach out to populations not already served. Frances de Usabel, consultant with the Division for Library Services, Department of Public Instruction, did some brainstorming with Don Lamb, administrator of the Dane County Library Service. He recalled that Julie Chase of the Middleton Library had recently talked with him about this same subject. Joan Sullivan, outreach librarian with Dane County Library Service, joined the group bringing with her an interest in learning-disabled readers as well as knowledge about the Library Literacy Project in progress in Janesville, Wisconsin under Deb Johnson. Lamb and Sullivan contacted the Madison Literacy Council.

At approximately the same time, a group of adults were forming the Wisconsin Branch of the Orton Dyslexia Society. This brought together people whose interests were concerned with language-disabled children and adults. The author, who was president of the Madison Literacy Council, was one of these. A Dyslexia Support Group that met each month was formed and was made up of adult dyslexics, teachers, parents of dyslexic children, and others interested in specific language

disabilities. A strong interest in the Orton-Gillingham approach to teaching phonics was expressed, but in the Madison area there were only a very few people trained in this method. Where would nonreaders and poor spellers get the instruction they needed?

Madison Area Technical College showed an interest in helping dyslexics. Sara Sherkow of the General Studies Department encouraged the author to start a class for people who had a problem with words. "Living With Dyslexia" drew thirty adults on the first evening of the class and was repeated six weeks later and every semester since then. Many of these adults wanted help with reading and spelling. Something had to be done about providing trained tutors. While many of these adults were handicapped in language skills, most were functioning at a higher level than the Laubach materials of the Madison Literacy Council.

Again the Madison Area Technical College responded, this time by offering a summer workshop/practicum for teachers or tutors. Arlene Sonday, a nationally known reading teacher and skilled Orton-Gillingham trainer, was brought from St. Paul, Minnesota to demonstrate and explain the approach as well as supervise the practicum experience for workshop participants. There are now over fifty newly trained tutors in the Dane County area with some training in the method who are ready and eager to assist nonreaders.

These three forces, independent of each other yet closely connected in their aims and aspirations, managed to converge much as planets moving in space. This is reflected in the goals that follow, taken from the application for a second year of the LSCA grant:

1. To increase the library staff awareness of the literacy problem and of their role in providing assistance to persons of special need.
2. To maintain and improve the newly established literacy training centers in four Dane County libraries geographically distributed around the county to provide volunteer tutor recruitment and training, individual student placement and instruction, and collections of supplementary literacy materials for circulation.
3. To add computer software programs to the literacy materials available to tutors and students because of the importance of multisensory learning.
4. To promote general awareness of public libraries in Dane County as providers of literacy resources.
5. To make literacy materials available to all Dane County residents through collections of print and audiocassette materials as well as through interlibrary loan from the literacy centers.

6. To increase the number of literacy tutors in Dane County, outside of Madison, by providing eight tutor training classes of twelve hours each, these classes to be in basic literacy instruction with an added component in working with learning difficulties.
7. To establish ESL (English as a second language) classes of twelve hours each.
8. To place each trained tutor with a client for individual instruction.
9. To train Madison Literacy Council tutor trainers in the Orton-Gillingham approach so that this skill in diagnosis and teaching can be added to the tutor-training program, and follow-up assistance will be available to tutors as needed.
10. To develop and publish materials adapting the Orton-Gillingham teaching approach to each level of Laubach instruction.
11. To disseminate information about the program and its results as requested.

The Role of the Libraries

The role played by the libraries in this joint venture consists of providing space for teacher-training sessions, setting up major collections of supplementary literacy materials, becoming involved in information and referral roles, and taking part in in-service training programs set up by the MLC.

Joan Sullivan, as project administrator, is responsible for coordinating the program, ordering and distributing the materials, completing evaluations and reports, maintaining financial records, and assisting in developing a set of manuals to blend the Orton-Gillingham approach with the Laubach materials.

To coordinate the combined effort, the MLC employed Kay Bradley, whose responsibility it was to meet with librarians, plan publicity, set up training sessions, interview prospective tutors, match up tutors and clients, facilitate communication, recommend materials, plan in-service meetings, and keep the board of directors informed of all details of the program.

Bradley has taken courses in understanding dyslexia, and workshops in the Orton-Gillingham approach in order to assist new tutors who find themselves tutoring people with language handicaps. She also arranges for follow-up training sessions as requested by new tutors. (This year the program is responding to the increased numbers of people who are immigrants and have moved into Dane County. English as a second language has been added to the basic tutoring courses of the first year.)

In summary, dyslexics are potential users of libraries. They are intelligent people who are eager to learn, yet experience great difficulty in learning by reading. Ignorance by the general public surrounds and compounds their problems. As one victim phrases it, dyslexics are imprisoned by their handicap. They need help in opening doors and providing keys to our literary heritage.

On the last evening of her "Living with Dyslexia" class a young lady handed her instructor the following poem:

A Dyslexic We May Be
by Judy K. Schara

The problems of a dyslexic are as big as an elephant,
But with work, care and love they'll become as small as an ant.

We have our ups and downs,
But, really, we're not a bunch of clowns.

The words get all mixed up and jumbled,
And some letters even upside-down-tumbled.

North, South, East, or West...Which is which?
If we're not careful, we'll end up in a ditch.

All jumbled and jived our words do come out,
And to straighten them out can be quite a bout.

Panic was our middle name, when asked to read aloud,
For the words often seemed to be in a cloud.

As readers we are very slow,
For many of the words we don't know.

In some things we're beyond the diploma we hold,
But in others we're in the dark like a mole.

We have no real limitations,
For we have no boundaries on our imaginations.

We are fighters from the word "go,"
Just try to box us in and you'll find out...so.

Slow, lazy, retarded, non-achievers, and emotionally disturbed are a few of our mis-labels,
We're really just mis-wired, but quite stable.

You'll find us in every walk of life, from doctor, lawyer, to Indian chief,
All we ask of you is to have in us faith, confidence, trust and belief.

We are in very good company...Rockefeller, Edison, DaVinci, Einstein and Yeats,
Just to name a few...Now if that list won't do,
Add Mary, Anna, Ed and John, Judy, Claudia, Debbie, and Ron,
And I could go on, and on, and on.

Like snowflakes, no two of us are alike, but take a chance,
Get to know us...We can be quite a delight.

References

1. The Orton Dyslexia Society (ODS), 724 York Road, Baltimore, Md. 21204. Best resource for information on dyslexia. Request publications list for books, monographs, pamphlets, and reprints of research and major addresses. Cumulative indexes for annual *Bulletins* since 1950. Name changed to *Annals of Dyslexia* in 1982.

2. Orton, June L. "The Orton-Gillingham Approach." In *The Disabled Reader: Education of the Dyslexic Child,* edited by John Money, pp. , Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

3. Galaburda, Albert. "Developmental Dyslexia: Current Research" (ODS Reprint No. 99). *Annals,* 1983.

4. Chall, Jeanne. *Learning to Read, the Great Debate.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

5. Gillingham, Anna, and Stillman, Bessie. *Remedial Training for Children with Specific Disability in Reading, Spelling, and Penmanship,* (seven editions, basic text). Cambridge, Mass.: Educators Publishing Service, Inc., 1940. See also ODS Reprint No. 11, June L. Orton.

6. Murray, C.A. "The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Current Theory and Knowledge." Rockville, Md.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, 1981. (The booklet is available free by writing to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850 or phone 608/238-4343.)

Additional References

For autobiographical books by dyslexics see:

Fleming, Elizabeth H. *Believe the Heart: Our Dyslexic Days.* San Francisco, Calif.: Strawberry Hill Press, 1984.

Hampshire, Susan. *Susan's Story: An Autobiographical Account of My Struggle with Words.* London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1981.

Simpson, Eileen. *Reversals: A Personal Account of Victory Over Dyslexia.* Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1979.

For publication lists of books, monographs, pamphlets, and reprints of research and major addresses of dyslexia, the following address is the best resource:

The Orton Dyslexia Society (ODS), 724 York Road, Baltimore, MD 21204. Also available are the annual *Bulletins*—now named *Annals of Dyslexia* since changed in 1982—from 1950.

Doehring, Donald G. "What Do We Know About Reading Disabilities? Closing the Gap Between Research and Practice." *Annals of Dyslexia* 33(1984):175-83.

Geschwin, Norman. "Why Orton was Right" (ODS Reprint No. 98). Baltimore, Md.: Orton Dyslexia Society.

Kranes, Judith Ehre. *The Hidden Handicap.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980.

Long, Kate. *Johnny's Such a Bright Boy, What a Shame He's Retarded.* Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1977.

Masland, Richard L. "Brain Mechanisms Underlying the Language Function" (ODS Reprint No. 18). Baltimore, Md.: Orton Dyslexia Society.

Rawson, Margaret Byrd. "Dyslexics as Adults: The Possibilities and the Challenge" (ODS Reprint No. 22). Baltimore, Md.: Orton Dyslexia Society.

Rome, Howard D. "The Psychiatric Aspect of Dysteria" (ODS Reprint No. 38). Baltimore, Md.: Orton Dyslexia Society.

Libraries and Employability

ANN R. GEHLEN

THERE IS GENERAL AGREEMENT that libraries have both an informational and an educational function. The extent and depth of each function will vary depending on the library's perception of its mission and its community's needs. The definition of its mission causes each library to react differently to the needs of its users.

The broadest definition of *literacy* is that an individual have the skills needed to function effectively in society; by this definition, the skills and information the library can provide on employability are part of the overall drive to have a literate society.[1] The question of the role of the library in relation to the employability of its users is not a question that arises in good times or in stable times. However, the last ten years have been times of great change and very unsettled employment. The computerization of the office, the automation of factories, the baby boomers hitting their thirties, the energy crisis, soaring imports, and the graying of America are all factors in the destabilized work picture.[2]

It was not very long ago that career decisions were made by persons in their midteens who, for the most part, continued to do the same job for all their working lives—or at least that was the expectation. Radical changes were rare and often perceived as inappropriate when made. But the more people do something the more acceptable it becomes. This applies to job and career changing.

Due to plant closings and moves to other states or countries, changing production techniques, jobs ceasing to exist, and whole new categories of jobs, employment is no longer static. The result is that a person

Ann R. Gehlen is Head, ACE (Adult Continuing Education), Forsyth County Public Library System, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

may expect to make five or more job or career changes. The expansion of many surviving businesses into large multinational companies and the accompanying complexity of hiring structures to meet governmental regulations have changed the way many people get a job: it is ineffective just to file an application with the local major employer and wait to be called to work.

Provision of the information and skills needed to cope with this changing working world is an appropriate activity for the information services section of the library. The needs of this type of user fall into three categories: (1) career choice or career change information; (2) job-hunting skills; and (3) career development skills. With these goes the need to disseminate information about educational opportunities to enhance the user's skills since this type of development is generally perceived by the user to be concurrent with the effective development of other employability skills.

These are not radical new areas in which no services have been provided. In the past, information on all of these topics existed within a general public library collection and the good reader adviser pulled them out. Few, if any, public libraries lack items that deal with career choice. Most, for instance, have the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* from the U.S. Department of Labor, the local newspaper (and perhaps the nearby larger city newspapers), a college guide, and a couple of résumé books. However, the depth and the diversity of the needs of the many persons involved in job displacement, career change, and initial job hunting force the consideration by library administrators of ways to better deal with this general area. The exploration of possible ways to improve service has been aided by the availability of Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) monies.

The ACE (Adult Continuing Education) program of the Forsyth County Public Library system in Winston-Salem, North Carolina is an example of the use of LSCA seed money to start a long-term program. (This is cited not because it is one of the older programs but because as its head since 1978, the author is most familiar with it.) The ACE project was started in fiscal year 1976 by Nancy Doyle Bolt and received three years of federal funding before it was absorbed totally into the library budget; it has remained an intrinsic part of that budget ever since. ACE was begun at the request of two different Forsyth County agencies: the Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce and the Academic Urban Affairs Consortium. The former expressed the community's need for coordination of efforts to aid the adult seeking work; the latter needed to determine what educational information adults want and what was

being offered to meet those needs. ACE has grown from serving an average of twenty users a day to serving an average of eighty-five users or more, depending largely on the current local employment picture. ACE is a broker of programs and options available in the community. In this way cooperation among many agencies is assured and the library functions in its more comfortable role as the provider of neutral information. The Adult Continuing Education program has always included those options related to employability partly because of the initial mandate but mostly because these are what adults need to know and want to learn.

Two Approaches to Service Implementation

The first approach to service implementation adds material and resources to the present collection leaving it within the traditional structures but increasing its visibility to both staff and potential users. Ohio's Books/Jobs Program started out using this approach and grew. This approach works well with small collections or as a first step when resources for large, more intensive projects are lacking.

For example, the Wake County Public Library was one of the first in North Carolina to offer a special program (Adult Learning Information Center) in employability skills. Wake County no longer has this program but has continued to cater to the needs of the job seeker by buying heavily in this area and by offering a self-service section of job listings, tips on job hunting, and the do-it-yourself career guidance tool OCC-U-SORT.[3]

The second approach pulls existing material out into a separate collection and assigns it a special subject status. This approach requires more commitment of resources in terms of space, technical services, and specialization of staff. It is exemplified by Learner's Advisory/Job Information Services at New York Public Library and ACE at Forsyth County Public Library. Both these programs have separate departmental status within the library; this includes not only staffing but such mundane but necessary things as separate phone lines, work space, publications, and community relations. Both have maintained a continuity of leadership in service delivery that enables the programs to be both the referral of choice for other job service-providers and effective advocates for those seeking both basic and advanced employability skills.[4] A hybrid of the two approaches is found in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, where collections are at the branches but the specialist visits on a regularly scheduled basis to provide in-depth services to prescheduled users.[5]

The Need for Special Skills

A commonality of skills is needed by the professionals who advise those seeking employability skills through the services of the reader's adviser, the educational broker, or the information and referral (I&R) librarian. All these positions require a thorough knowledge of the resources available including both print and nonprint materials, good reference interviewing skills, and ability to present materials so as to encourage use while at the same time remaining neutral about the person's final selection from options provided in response to their questions. There is in this type of reference no right answer, only a selection of possible choices. This in turn engenders a need for an open, nonjudgmental attitude on the part of the librarian (or other professional) toward the user's questions, needs and goals, and decisions.

Many of the answers to the questions of the "recareerer" of novice job hunters are best found in a thorough knowledge of local resources and personal contacts. The use of community resources (while not previously unheard of) now becomes one of the best ways to respond to a user's need. The system of reciprocal referral among agencies can improve the library's image as a usable resource. It will also involve the librarian in the structures of other service providers. This can be seen in Enoch Pratt Free Library's participation in Baltimore's Community Action program or Forsyth County's participation on the advisory boards of the Winston-Salem Urban League (Women in Nontraditional Jobs Programs) and Forsyth Technical College (Individualized Learning Centers) as well as membership in the Winston-Salem Personnel Association, which motivates personnel officers in the local area.[6]

Choice and flexibility are important for any adult learner. Learning to find or change jobs in the work environment of the 1980s is of necessity a preoccupation of adults who find themselves (or those they know) to be burned out, displaced, on the outplacement list, or without the career mobility they expected. Tools for coping are part of the information resources of libraries. While not every person seeking increased employability skills will use the library, its anonymity, familiarity, and neutrality will appeal to a certain percentage. (This is no different from any other library service, each of which attracts only part of the total users.)

This user group will need different levels of service at different stages of their career development process.[7] Some may just need basic job-hunting or job-holding material such as that in the Ohio/Jobs Project or that which is repeatedly cited in basic lists.[8] The person

preparing for employment will also find it helpful if the library is able to provide public access computers and typewriters. At another point they might want some major career interest evaluation or selection aids that come in a variety of forms including the pen-and-pencil, no-score variety, the interpreted-by-a-psychologist test, and computer databases such as SIGI PLUS, COIN, GIS (to identify some of the more commonly used self-scoring programs).[9] The purpose of all this variety is to provide the user with options in the selection of a career; this in turn necessitates the provision of ample information on the careers themselves and on decision-making skills.

Job hunting requires other skills in self-appraisal and presentation. These needs are met not just with print and nonprint material but with workshops on how to do it (that is, become employed), critiqued résumés, dress for success, and successful interviewing. These should be presented by personnel officers or other community experts. These same resource people can aid in the presentation of other support workshops on financial aid for the adult student, selection of the right continuing education program to meet individual goals, or retirement as a career transition. This group activity can lead to other support activities that encourage the job hunter to continued effort such as job clubs.

Bethlehem Public Library in Delmar, New York, has developed a system for the delivery of specialized job-hunting support. They provide the facilities and the guidance needed for the job seeker to form a successful job club. A job club meets once or twice a week to encourage its members in the job-hunting process, exchange job leads, and practice job-hunting and interviewing skills.[10]

Most adult learning is triggered by transitions in an adult's career. It may involve skills needed to obtain a new job, to maintain the current position, or to get a promotion. These common needs have led most programs that deal with employability skills to be aware of all the educational opportunities relating to their users' needs. This need in turn creates a whole different network of community connections among those groups offering adult learning opportunities. Thus there are interlocking boards and cooperative consortia such as AREA (Admissions Recruiters in Education Association). Both Forsyth County Public Library ACE and Greensboro Public Library North Carolina LEO (Lifetime Educational Opportunities) are members of this five-county organization, and their membership ensures that the recruiters for two-year and four-year schools in the area are informed and sensitive to the needs of the adult learner. The recruiters in turn

provide information on new offerings and ways to ease the entry of adults into the educational world. They are also excellent resources for back-to-school programs or paying for skill upgrading when the employer will not. This educational gap is also why many of the library programs meeting the needs of the job hunter or career changer are closely identified with either educational brokering or adult learner projects.[11]

The concept of the library as a resource for employability skills has gone from the innovative stage to being part of the standard role of the library in providing the community with needed information. This becomes clear when the widespread geographic locations of such programs (Spokane to Newark and Pascagoula, Mississippi, to Westchester County, New York) as well as the variety of populations are considered. Programs of this type are found in rural upstate New York and in metropolitan areas of declining and expanding employment. Statewide funding in New York and local funding in North Carolina, Ohio, and Illinois provide the hard monies needed to sustain these services and to refine them into forms that can be attempted by most libraries at reasonable costs. These operating programs provide other libraries with a selection of approaches from which they may choose the parts that best meet the level of their users' needs and best utilize their communities' resources.

References

1. Lyman, Helen H. "Literacy Education as Library Community Service." *Library Trends* 28(Fall 1979):194-97.

2. These factors are common knowledge, but, at times, one tends to look at them separately rather than as concurrent contributors to the problem.

3. Jones, Lawrence K., and Reilly, Carol. "Expanding Career Information Options in the Public Library—The OCC-U-SORT Kit." *Public Libraries* 22(Winter 1983):131-35.

4. Tarin, Patricia, and Shapiro, Barbara. "Learning, Jobs, and the Quality of Life." *Library Journal* 106(1 Dec. 1981):2365-69.

5. Patterson to Gehlen, personal communication, 1979.

6. Shubert, Joseph F., and Dowlin, C. Edwin. "Ohio's Books/Jobs Program." *Library Journal* 95(1 Oct. 1970):3239-43.

7. Public Library Association, Job and Career Information Services Committee, Alternative Education Programs Section. *Job and Career Information Centers for Public Libraries: A Step-by-Step Manual.* Chicago: ALA, 1985.

8. Two readily available and frequently updated lists: Bolles, Richard N. *What Color is Your Parachute?* 2d rev. and enl. ed. Berkeley, Calif.: Ten Speed Press, 1984; and Public Library PLACE Services Career Project. *Career Books by Occupational Category and Special Career Topics.* Cuyahoga County, Ohio. (Available upon request to the librarians: Cuyahoga County Public Library, 4510 Memphis Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44144.)

9. The trademarks SIGI PLUS, COIN, GIS are owned by Education Testing Service, Bell and Howell, and Time Share Corp. respectively.

10. Desch, Carol Ann. "Adult Services; Meeting the Challenge: Adult Job Seekers in the Public Library." *RQ* 23(Spring 1984):275-81.

11. Tarin, and Shapiro, "Learning, Jobs, and the Quality of Life," p. 2366.

Additional References

Aslanian, Carol B., and Brickell, Henry M. *Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.

Beiman, Frances. "Job Info Centers." *Library Journal* 107(1 May 1982):836.

Berry, John. "Recession: A Library Response." *Library Journal* 106(15 Dec. 1981):2345.

Burge, Elizabeth J., ed. "Adult Learner, Learning and Public Libraries." *Library Trends* 31(Spring 1983):513-686.

Carter, Jane Robbins, ed. *Public Librarianship, A Reader*. Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1982.

"Job/Career Info Service Opens in Baltimore County." *Library Journal* 106(15 June 1981):1266.

"Job Services and Info Centers Run by Libraries." *Library Journal* 101(15 May 1976):1174.

Katz, William. "The Uncertain Realities of Reference Service." *Library Trends* 31(Winter 1983):363-74.

Meyers, Arthur S. "Libraries Serve the Unemployed." *RQ* 24(Fall 1984):27-31.

Rouse, David A. "Help Wanted: The Job Searcher and the Librarian." *Illinois Libraries* 65(Oct. 1983):521-24.

Westbrook, Bert W. *Career Development Needs of Adults: How to Improve Career Development Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Vocational Guidance Association, 1977.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Evaluation of Library Literacy Projects

DEBRA WILCOX JOHNSON

LIBRARY INVOLVEMENT IN LITERACY projects has been extensively described in the literature. Activities range from purchasing special materials for new readers to participating in one-to-one tutoring. There is, however, a lack of understanding on how to effectively evaluate literacy programs in libraries. The reports of evaluation focus on usage figures and qualitative data from participants. Overall, the evaluation process primarily addresses the general question: "Did you meet the objectives set for your project?" Lipsman recommends that "cost, convenience and ease of collection, reliability of data, and possible disruption to ongoing operations"[1] be primary considerations in developing an evaluation model.

Birge reports libraries have had limited success in obtaining patron responses to literacy programs.[2] Planning the evaluation is cited by Birge as one of the most difficult tasks for literacy program planners. Because of this difficulty, evaluation is seldom planned ahead of time and often the data needed to evaluate the project are not collected. As a result, many library literacy programs are criticized as being expensive, ineffectual, and unnecessary (e.g., Lipsman). The projects have been characterized as "elitist in concept, tunnelvisioned in scope, poorly planned in educational methodology, costly, beyond description...."[3]

Debra Wilcox Johnson is a doctoral candidate and researcher on the Libraries and Literacy Education Project, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

The problem, then, facing libraries providing a social action program such as literacy services is to effectively evaluate the project. This article will examine the criteria used in evaluation of library literacy programs. Evaluation models that have been used in literacy projects will be reviewed, and suggestions for developing an evaluation model will be presented.

Library Literacy Programs

Before discussing evaluation of library literacy programs, it is necessary to define those programs. There is not one "typical" program. Depending on the community need, resources, and interest, library literacy projects have developed a variety of approaches, ranging from a cooperative role of providing materials, space, and equipment to a teaching role of providing one-to-one tutoring or sponsoring classes. Activities include publicity of literacy services, in-service education for tutors and teachers, and referral of potential students and tutors.

The evaluation approach used will vary depending on the type of library literacy activities carried out. Therefore, the evaluation techniques used cannot rely solely on "reading achievement" of students, since many library literacy programs are not direct providers of instruction. In developing evaluation criteria, the list needs to be expanded to cover noninstructional as well as instructional activities.

Success

A definition of a "successful" library literacy program has not been clearly addressed in the literature. It is implied, however, that continued existence is the primary indicator of success. Lipsman, in her study of library programs for the disadvantaged, identifies six factors that contribute to a program's successful implementation: (1) participation by outside groups in the project; (2) evidence of the importance of the activity to community decision and policymakers; (3) project visibility (public relations); (4) staff competency, including library training, capacity for leadership, good interpersonal skills, etc.; (5) quality of materials chosen; and (6) high degree of autonomy of project staff.[4] Recently, the standards suggested in *Guidelines for Effective Adult Literacy Programs* support and greatly expand on Lipsman's list, including networking, community assessment, and setting of project goals.[5] These guidelines, developed in cooperation with representatives from literacy agencies, offer librarians another view of features considered necessary for an effective program providing direct instruction.

Theoretical Setting

The proposed evaluation models have a common theoretical basis, referred to in the literature as the "goal-attainment" or "discrepancy" model. Schulberg and Baker identify this as a prevalent categorization of evaluation procedures,[6] and Weiss uses this model in assessing the effectiveness of social programs.[7] DuMont and DuMont refer to goal attainment as "by far the most common and frequently discussed measure of library effectiveness."[8] Grotelueschen, Gooler, and Knox define discrepancy evaluation as "any evaluation approach emphasizing the discrepancy between performance of a...program...and prespecified criteria of adequacy (e.g., program goals, objectives, ideal state)."[9]

Essential to the goal-attainment model is the clarification of program objectives. The model includes evaluation of the progress of the project along with the final achievement of the objectives. Talmage calls these two stages formative and summative. Formative evaluation is conducted during the planning and implementation phases of a project to allow for changes during these stages. Summative evaluation determines the worth of a project following a set time period.[10] The results of the summative evaluation are used to modify the project's original goals and objectives, creating a cyclical approach to evaluation. This cyclical approach may take into account three major purposes: (1) to justify a program (past orientation); (2) to improve a program (present orientation); and (3) to plan a program (future orientation).[11]

Objective-based evaluation models are grouped by Stufflebeam and Webster into two evaluation categories. In questions-oriented studies (called quasi-evaluation studies), the authors place objective-based studies that are noncyclical—i.e., the information gained is not used to improve the program—in this category. Cyclical objective-based studies, however, would be categorized as value-oriented studies, since they assess worth of the program and implement changes to improve the project. Stufflebeam and Webster see this group as "true evaluation."[12]

In developing an evaluation model for library literacy projects, a variety of evaluation methods could be used within the theoretical framework of the goal-attainment model. This diversity of methods would allow for the variety of measures that presently is used by library personnel in setting program objectives and in determining program effectiveness.

Evaluation Criteria

Library literature offers adequate information on the history of library literacy projects, selection of materials, guidelines to use in starting a project, profiles of individual programs, and the characteristics of adult new readers. There is, however, limited information on techniques for evaluating library literacy projects. Although frequently cited as a crucial step in developing library literacy projects, evaluation of specific library literacy projects is usually reported as secondary information to the description of the program. Birge concludes that evaluation techniques and the degree of the evaluation process vary among the literacy projects. "The amounts and kind of data sought and collected may differ considerably, depending on such variables as type of program, size of library and number of learners, access to computer analysis, and need or desire to coordinate data with those from other libraries and programs."[13]

Finding a way to measure effectiveness of library programs is not a problem unique to literacy activities. DuMont and DuMont, in their review of measuring library effectiveness, cite a lack of training in how to carry out evaluation, primitive evaluation instruments, and the complexity of determining the impact of the library on a community as reasons why more effective evaluation is not done.[14] Interestingly, Smith classes "the development of means and approaches for evaluating the effectiveness of the library's literacy effort"[15] as an "initiatory position" activity, indicating that this activity is seen as appropriate by only a small portion of those libraries most active in literacy projects.

Descriptions of library literacy projects give clues to some measures used in evaluating library literacy projects. MacDonald[16] and Hiatt and Drennan,[17] in their early surveys of library literacy programs, found "success" of these programs measured by number of users of the services, circulation of materials, amount of interagency cooperation, behavioral changes in participants (as reported on opinion surveys and through observation), and requests for service.

Lipsman conducted a research project to collect data on "available measures of the impact or effectiveness of the program."[18] Her study, combining case studies and surveys, showed a number of impact measures currently being used: circulation count, number of people coming into the library, number participating in the activities, requests for services, reactions from participants, involvement with other agencies, and follow-up on individual participants. Of these, Lipsman found circulation and the number participating the most frequently used measures of program impact.[19]

Lyman's profiles of several library literacy projects showed evaluation measures that fell into two general categories: use statistics (of materials, facilities, services) and opinions of participants including students, librarians, and tutors or teachers.[20]

Erteschik reviewed sixty-two outstanding projects funded by the Library Services and Construction Act of which eight were related to literacy.[21] Evaluation measures were similar to earlier reports with statistics collected on number of students or participants, use of materials, percentage of increase in library use, number of tutors trained, number of referrals to the project, and amount of interagency cooperation. These project reports, however, emphasized the effects of the program on its intended audiences. Attempts were made to document changes in students' lives—e.g., job changes, completion of GED (General Education Degree), driver's tests passed. These "changes" were usually student-reported, documented in case studies, and reported in student self-evaluations of the program's effects on their lives.

The most recent directory of library literacy programs was compiled in 1978 by the American Library Association.[22] A total of ninety-one programs was reported, with each entry providing data on the results of the project and a multitude of evaluation measures. As noted in other reports, these measures encompassed usage figures for services, facilities, and materials; the degree of participation by outside agencies; and the amount of publicity received. Qualitative data were gathered from students, librarians, tutors and teachers, and participating agencies. These data were collected through surveys, observations, and anecdotal reports of participants' use and behavior in the library, case studies, student evaluation of personally set goals, student-reported changes in their lives, follow-up of learners' progress through personal interviews and telephone conversations, progress reports by tutors, and staff evaluations. Some newly reported effectiveness measures were included, most notably that of continued existence and funding as a sign of success. After consideration this may be an appropriate measure since tightening library funding usually affects social action and outreach projects first. Other unique measures reported were: publication of bibliographies and distribution level; referral of new program participants by current and past participants; requests to repeat programs; number of phone calls regarding the literacy services; learner demographic profiles; size and existence of waiting lists; and requests for information from other libraries on program features.

The California Literacy Campaign evaluated its newly organized statewide project in 1984.[23] The evaluation was based on the intended outcomes of the program, on gathering information from project

reports, on questionnaires to project directors and tutors, and on telephone interviews with students. The main success indicators were based on client satisfaction, primarily the students and tutors. Students were queried regarding their evaluation of the program, tutors, and their own progress. Changes in student library use were also explored. The interviewer asked if the students had checked out materials or visited a library since participating in the program. Baseline measures, however, were not taken on library use prior to the student starting the program.

Following a review of the variety of evaluation measures used in library literacy programs, a researcher is left with a picture of the types of measures that might be used but no set direction for a systematic and standard evaluation process. Clearly each literacy program, based on the objectives set for the project, has determined what, if any, measures to use primarily dictated by expediency of data collection. There does seem, however, to be a combination of "numbers gathering" on the use of services, facilities, and materials, and qualitative data from program participants. A third implied measure of success is continued existence and funding. This combination of three categories of measurement is reflected in four proposed evaluation models reported in the literature.

Evaluation Models

Lipsman's proposed evaluation model has four main components: (1) setting objectives related to individual and community needs; (2) planning and implementation carrying forward these objectives; (3) determining if output (results) reflects achievement of objectives, thus satisfaction of user needs; and (4) asking if resource inputs (costs) are appropriate to the level of output.[24] Basic to the successful application of this model are workable, clearly defined performance objectives. Lipsman recommends collecting data by review of existing report documents, interviews, observation, and questionnaires. The type of data to be collected is defined as: number of users; characteristics and interests of patrons; types of materials circulated; types of information given, requested, and not provided; anecdotal notes of happenings in libraries; feedback from community organizations; characteristics of nonusers; and cost of program features. Lipsman sees as an evaluation "ideal" measurement of the library's impact on a target group. This would be done through pre-test and post-test measures, control group comparisons, and longitudinal follow-up study of participants in sustained library activity.[25]

Lyman proposed an evaluation process compatible with Lipsman's objectives-based model. For Lyman the goals and objectives,

along with a timetable, are the basis for the evaluation that is achieved by "looking at what has happened in relation to the function and objectives established for the service."[26] The pattern of evaluation has six elements: (1) summary of program effectiveness; (2) penetration in terms of reader groups; (3) participant impact; (4) library impact; (5) community impact; and (6) factors related to effectiveness.[27] Lyman, however, does not provide specific guidelines on what type of data to collect and how to collect it.

The Appalachian Adult Education Center (AAEC) proposed an evaluation model based on their field experience. In test programs combining adult basic education efforts with library literacy projects, the AAEC evaluation focused on the impact of the library programs on the quality of life of the participants. In early reports of the federally funded aspects of the project, the focus was on case studies of participants to identify changes in their level of coping skills. The 1975 AAEC report refines the evaluation process into four parts: (1) comparison to externally set standards—e.g., state, library, grant-specified standards; (2) accomplishment of objectives including records of new titles added, number and uses of deposit collections, what clients read, and resources used and their cost; (3) number of new library users from the target group; and (4) anecdotal records in the form of case studies that may be developed from structured personal interviews.[28] While the AAEC model does not provide specific tools for assessing whether objectives have been met, the evaluation model has been used in many libraries involved in the AAEC projects.

One of the most frequently cited evaluation models for library literacy projects is the "program effectiveness measure" developed by Barss, Reitzel, and Associates in 1972. The measure, based on responses to a telephone survey of library reading projects staff, has sixteen indicators of effectiveness:

1. increase in average attendance;
2. 90 to 100 percent regular attendance;
3. increase in regular attendance;
4. cooperation with community agencies;
5. program director's judgment of project benefits accrued;
6. changes in library use—e.g., circulation, number and type of users, types of materials circulated;
7. changes in library operation—e.g., policies, budget allocations;
8. requests for program expansion;
9. program staff reactions;
10. nonprogram staff reactions;

11. inquiries about the program from other libraries or groups;
12. adoption of program by at least one other library;
13. program director's citation the program met its goals;
14. program director's view of effect of program on library, participants, and community;
15. total attendance at all sites of 1000 or more; and
16. change in participants' skills or behavior.[29]

These indicators are drawn from actual evaluation measures reported by project staff on the telephone survey. The Barss evaluation model accepts these sixteen indicators as appropriate measures (perhaps it would be better to say realistic measures) and focuses on developing effective evaluation tools for measuring the final indicator—i.e., change in participants' skills or behavior. To determine the program's impact on participants, Barss conducted oral and written interviews with program participants. The interviews resulted in impact measurements in six areas: (1) reading (use of print) affect; (2) reading behavior; (3) reading skills and knowledge; (4) reading-related (use of nonprint materials) affect; (5) reading-related behavior; and (6) reading-related skills and knowledge.[30]

The Barss model, then, provides a framework for effectiveness measures as well as a process for measuring program impact on participants. The effectiveness measures are useful to all types of library literacy projects even those not directly involved in tutoring and teaching. The impact portion of the project seems more directly related to those programs that include tutoring and teaching. Although Barss was concerned with reading programs for all ages, he did field test his participant impact tool in two specific adult library literacy programs—Brooklyn and Los Angeles public libraries. Unfortunately, while the Barss model is frequently cited as exemplary, there are not reports in the literature of the model being used in actual library literacy programs beyond Barss's own field tests.

A Proposed Evaluation Model: An Outline

Grotelueschen provides an eight-step process for an evaluation plan.[31] The following proposed evaluation plan for a library literacy project uses these eight steps. The plan would be for a library project that carries out activities one through five with an optional activity six:

1. to be a cooperative link between providers of literacy activities in the community;

2. to provide materials, including computer software, to supplement local literacy efforts;
3. to publicize literacy efforts in the community in conjunction with other agencies;
4. to act as a referral agency for potential participants, potential tutors, and other interested groups;
5. to provide space for tutoring and offer tours and library instruction to interested groups; and
6. to offer direct instruction through tutoring or classes.

I. *Purpose.* The evaluation process will have three main purposes: to assist in planning, to improve the project, and to justify the program's existence.

II. *Audience.* For most libraries, the audience for evaluation results is diverse. As the decision-makers regarding library service priorities and funding, the library board of trustees would be the primary audience for the evaluation. If funding was received from an outside source, the evaluation would be used as part of the grant process. For cooperative projects, the agencies involved would become another member of the audience for evaluation results. These results would be of particular interest to the persons most closely involved in using the library services. For improvement of the project, the project staff and library administration would need the results from the evaluation. The governing body of the library—e.g., city council, county board—would be a potential audience for the summary evaluation to justify the program's existence.

III. *Issues.* In the broadest sense, the issue to be addressed is "were the objectives of the project met?" For the board of trustees and library administration, however, costs of the program related to outputs will be of primary concern. With cooperative agencies, a major concern will be the benefits accrued from the cooperation. Impact on participants—which would include tutors, adult basic education instructors, and adult new readers—will be of primary interest to the library staff, cooperative agencies, and usually, the funding source. One issue to be discussed in the planning stage is consensus on the goals and objectives of the project. This would, of course, involve the library staff, board of trustees, participants, and cooperative agency personnel. Effects of the project on the library—e.g., increased use of services—will concern the library staff.

IV. *Resources.* For most libraries, evaluation is conducted in-house with existing staff. Lipsman's primary considerations in evaluation

("cost, convenience and ease of collection, reliability of data, and possible disruption to ongoing operations"[32]) are to be kept in mind. As Smith found, personnel resources for literacy projects are usually restricted to one or two people whose work with the literacy project is only one part of their responsibilities.[33] For a grant-funded project, there may be more funds allocated for evaluation, but generally the cost of the evaluation is a small portion of the literacy project budget.

V. *Evidence.* A precise description of the project is the basis for what evidence should be collected in the evaluation. Following this description, the Barss "program effectiveness measure" provides several effectiveness indicators that may relate to the project.[34] Of the sixteen indicators developed by Barss, the following can apply under the project description offered earlier: cooperation with community agencies; program director's judgment of project benefits; changes in library use; changes in library operations; requests for program expansion; program staff reactions; inquiries about the program from other libraries or groups; adoption of program by at least one other library; program director's view of the effect of program on participants and community. In addition, those programs offering instruction would be able to use the remaining Barss indicators. It should be noted that these indicators depict actual evaluation measures used by libraries involved in literacy projects and, as such, should be considered potential evaluation measures in any evaluation model. Based on the literature review, one additional measure can be added to the Barss list—i.e., continued existence of the program.

Some refinements of the Barss measures, however, should be considered. With regard to the "cooperation" indicator, input on agreement of project objectives, benefits of the cooperation, and referral patterns should be received. The program director's view on the effects of the project and meeting of goals should be expanded to include input from library staff, participants, and cooperative agencies.

VI. *Data Gathering.* In planning the library literacy project, a survey of library staff, board members, administrators, personnel from cooperating agencies, tutors, and adult basic education (ABE) teachers can be used to develop the goals and activities of the project. Verbal input from adult new readers is also needed. Grotelueschen suggests several tools that could be used to measure perceptions of what "ought to be." People would be asked to show their perceptions of how resources should be distributed. For example, possible activities (related to the proposed project goals) are given a "percent of effort" to total 100 percent (see appendix A).[35] The listed activities could also be ranked to help determine program emphases.

The activities listed in the "distribution" questionnaire could also be measured on a rating scale such as "ideal emphasis" on a scale of 1 (little) to 5 (much). Another form of the rating scale would be to adapt the activity statements for a rating scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. For example, one statement might read, "The library can be an effective alternate source of audiovisual English as a second language (ESL) materials." The Lincoln Trail Libraries System (Champaign, Illinois) used this approach in surveying librarians, public library trustees, adult educators, and community agency personnel. Respondents also were asked to rate a series of activities on a ten-point scale of not desirable to highly desirable. Not only does this approach aid the library in setting program objectives, but it also points out differing perceptions of the library's role by nonlibrary people.

Collecting data on program outcomes requires different techniques depending on whether quantitative or qualitative data are being collected. For example, several of the indicators in the Barss list require straightforward record keeping—e.g., number of contacts with cooperating agencies; changes in library use (reference questions, circulation of materials, use of facilities); requests for program expansion; inquiries about the program from other libraries or groups; and adoption of the program by at least one other library. Two other indicators—changes in library operations (more flexible hours, budget allocations) and continued existence of the project—can usually be documented by the project director. For projects providing direct instruction, reading levels can be tested to determine student improvement.

The qualitative data, however, are less easily obtained and often are more time-consuming to collect. The qualitative data to be collected include: benefits of cooperation; completion of project activities; impact on participants (including the library); and referral patterns. One approach to collecting this information is to use instruments similar to those in the planning process, not only asking what ought to be but what they perceive the program to actually be doing. Grotelueschen discussed ways to document program outcomes.[36] One approach is to use a "satisfaction" questionnaire (see appendix B), which can be distributed to the library board and staff, cooperating agencies, and participants. This may be administered periodically to monitor participant satisfaction.

With regard to cooperative activities, Grotelueschen offers an assessment tool that asks agency representatives to select statements that "best reflect those outcomes your program has experienced as a result of cosponsorship and collaboration."[37] Both positive and negative statements would be included—e.g., (a) student recruitment was facilitated;

(b) public awareness of ABE was increased; (c) student use of library increased; (d) administrative trivia increased; and (e) confusion on the role of the library in literacy efforts was created. The Arrowhead Library System (Janesville, Wisconsin) used this approach in evaluating an LSCA project. Participants in the county literacy coalition were asked in a questionnaire to identify outcomes their programs experienced as a result of cooperative literacy activities; respondents were asked to provide specific examples of the outcomes.

The library literacy project described at the beginning of this section serves three main groups: adult new readers, tutors, and ABE teachers. Realistically, many of the contacts with adult new readers will be initiated by and through tutors and teachers. The program's impact on the latter two groups would be measured on previously described questionnaires. For the adult new reader two approaches can be used—oral interviews and anecdotal reports. The oral interview would focus on the person's response to the library services in relation to his or her needs. This would involve reactions to statements about personal experiences at the library as well as attitudes about the library. To help determine changes in student behavior (use of the library) and in their attitudes about the library, the interview also would be conducted at the beginning of the students' involvement in the program.

The anecdotal reports, used especially in the Appalachian Adult Education Center project, would combine the stories from students, tutors, and ABE instructors regarding the library's role in the adult learner's progress. These anecdotal case studies can provide a more personal perspective to the evaluation results and also can serve as the basis for publicity about the program. Oral interviews with students may also address the impact of the program in terms of the individual's personal learning goals, self-esteem, and willingness to participate in further learning activities.[38]

VII. *Analysis.* In keeping with the discrepancy model, analysis would focus on a comparison of "what discrepancies, if any, exist between what people think *ought* to be and what they perceive *actually* to be the case."[39] In the categories of data that involve number keeping, simple percentages of increased use or percentage of use in relation to other library activities would be used in the analysis. Improved reading levels of students would also be reported. Results from the questionnaires would be graphed for each group for comparison of perceptions. The oral participant interview combined with the case studies would provide a verbal description of the program's impact.

VIII. *Reporting.* The results would be summarized in written form

for most intended audiences. A more detailed description would be used by project staff and library administrators for improvement of the project.

Conclusion

A large number of library literacy programs are being conducted in public libraries. There is, however, little consensus on the degree or type of evaluation needed for these programs. While some evaluation models have been proposed, most lack a clear process for practitioners to follow. For the most part, these models have not had widespread use or field testing.

The development of an evaluation model for library literacy programs should consider the present measurements used by librarians in these programs. The Barss "program effectiveness measure" may provide a framework for categorizing the variety of measures described in the evaluation section. A second consideration is the need for valid instruments to determine, in particular, the effect of the literacy project on participants and the library. Grotelueschen provides a good starting point along with the Appalachian Adult Education Center's case study approach. Examples of instruments used (such as the California Literacy Campaign and the Lincoln Trail Libraries System questionnaires) need to be shared among project coordinators. Evaluation of student progress draws from the adult education field although more work is being done on assessing not only improvements in reading skills but also in changes in students' self-confidence, willingness to continue their learning, and the effect of the program on their economic status. B. Dalton Bookseller has contracted with the Matrices Consulting Group (Norwalk, Connecticut) to develop a student impact evaluation handbook that will be available early in 1987.

The need then is a practical one. An effective, cost-effective evaluation model will help in achieving the purposes behind evaluation. As Talmage writes, an evaluation provides a judgment on the worth of a program, assists in decision-making, and serves a political function.[40] Developing local financial support for projects started with grant funds remains a critical use for evaluation results.

Beyond the local situation, however, a more systematic and standard evaluation process will assist in comparing library literacy projects and in sharing program results. Consistent reporting of the impact of library literacy programs would contribute to improving standards for such programs. At present, comparing results from library literacy projects is like comparing apples to oranges. To develop an effective yet

expedient evaluation model seems the next logical step in the evolution of library literacy programs that began over 100 years ago.

Appendix A

Determination of Program Activity Priorities

Suppose you were able to decide how all of the time or effort would be distributed in the library literacy project. How would you allocate that effort? For each of the activities listed below, show what percentage of the total 100 percent effort you would have the library literacy project devote to that activity.

Activity	*Percent of effort*
Providing books to supplement teaching and tutoring programs	_____ %
Cosponsoring tutor training sessions	_____ %
Arrange for space for tutoring students	_____ %
Provide tours/inservice programs for ABE/ESL classes	_____ %
Publicize adult basic education services in the community	_____ %
Referral of potential ABE participants to appropriate agencies	_____ %
Provide ABE microcomputer software and equipment for in-library use	_____ %
Provide cassettes and records for ESL students	_____ %
	100%

(List other program activities as appropriate.)

Appendix B

Assessment of Satisfaction with Library Literacy Program

Please indicate the extent of your general satisfaction with the library literacy program *as you know it.*

	Highly Satisfied	*Quite Satisfied*	*Hardly Satisfied*	*Not Satisfied*	*Not Aware of Service*
1. Are you satisfied:					
with the type of books provided?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with the competence of the library staff you worked with on this project?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with the amount of space available to you for tutoring?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with the library's policy regarding microcomputers?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

(continue with examples of other program activities)

References

1. Lipsman, Claire K. *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness.* Chicago: ALA, 1972, p. 143.

2. Birge, Lynn E. *Serving Adult Learners: A Public Library Tradition.* Chicago: ALA, 1981.

3. Doak, Wes. "Libraries and Literacy: Match or Mismatch?" In *Libraries and Literacy: The Problem of Illiteracy in the United States and What Libraries Can Do About It* (Proceedings of San Francisco Public Library Workshop, 21-22 Sept. 1977)(ED 148 392), edited by Anne Roughton, p. 45. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Education, 1981.

4. Lipsman, *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness,* pp. 65-69.

5. Mayer, Steven E. *Guidelines for Effective Adult Literacy Programs.* Minneapolis, Minn.: B. Dalton Bookseller, 1985.

6. Schulberg, Herbert C., and Baker, Frank. "Program Evaluation Models and the Implementation of Research Findings." *Journal of Public Health* 58(July 1968):1248-55.

7. Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation Research: Methods for Assessing Program Effectiveness.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

8. DuMont, Rosemary Ruhig, and DuMont, Paul F. "Measuring Library Effectiveness: A Review and Assessment." In *Advances in Librarianship,* vol. 9, edited by Michael H. Harris, p. 111. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

9. Grotelueschen, Arden, et al. *Evaluation in Adult Basic Education: How and Why.* Urbana: University of Illinois, 1976, p. 260.

10. Talmage, Harriet. "Evaluation of Programs." In *Encyclopedia of Educational Research,* vol. 2, 5th ed., edited by Harold E. Mitzel et al., p. 603. New York: Free Press, 1982.

11. Grotelueschen, Arden. "Program Evaluation." In *Developing, Administering, and Evaluating Adult Education,* edited by Alan Knox and Associates, pp. 75-123. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

12. Stufflebeam, David, and Webster, William J. "An Analysis of Alternative Approaches to Evaluation." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 2(May/June 1980):8, 10, 19.

13. Birge, *Serving Adult Learners,* p. 171.

14. DuMont, and DuMont, "Measuring Library Effectiveness," pp. 104-06.

15. Smith, Ester G. *Libraries in Literacy,* vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, 1981, p. 31.

16. MacDonald, Bernice. *Literacy Activities in Public Libraries: A Report of a Study of Services to Adult Illiterates.* Chicago: ALA, Adult Services Division, Committee on Reading Improvements for Adults, 1966.

17. Hiatt, Peter, and Drennan, Henry, eds. *Public Library Services for the Functionally Illiterate: A Survey of Practice.* Chicago: ALA, 1967.

18. Lipsman, *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness,* p. 143.

19. Ibid., pp. 45-46.

20. Lyman, Helen Huguenor. *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries.* Chicago: ALA, 1977.

21. Erteschik, Ann. *Library Programs Worth Knowing About* (ED 145 858). Washington, D.C.: Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, 1977.

22. American Library Association. *Directory of Literacy and Adult Learning Programs.* Chicago: ALA, 1978.

23. Lane, Martha A. et al. *California Literacy Campaign Program Effectiveness Review.* Sacramento: California State Library, 1984.

24. Lipsman, *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness.*

25. Ibid.

26. Lyman, Helen Huguenor. *Reading and the Adult New Reader.* Chicago: ALA, 1976, p. 237.

27. Ibid., p. 238.

28. Appalachian Adult Education Center. *Planning Expanded Library Services for Disadvantaged Adults.* Morehead, Ky.: AAEC, 1975, pp. 14-16.

29. Barss, Reitzel, and Associates. *A Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading and Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth, and Adults* (ED 066 197). Cambridge, Mass.: Barss, Reitzel, & Assoc., 1972.

30. Ibid., pp. 20-21, 362, 376.

31. Grotelueschen, "Program Evaluation."

32. Lipsman, *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness,* p. 143.

33. Smith, Ester G., *Libraries in Literacy,* vol. 1, p. 45.

34. Barss, Reitzel, and Associates. *A Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading.*

35. Grotelueschen et al., *Evaluation in Adult Basic Education,* pp. 71-96.

36. Ibid., pp. 121-55.

37. Ibid., p. 153.

38. Mayer, *Guidelines for Effective Adult Literacy Programs,* p. 71.

39. Grotelueschen et al., *Evaluation in Adult Basic Education,* p. 72.

40. Talmage, "Evaluation of Programs," p. 594.

The Meanings of the Adult Independent Library Learning Project

DAVID CARR

DURING THE YEARS I SPENT thinking and writing about the Adult Independent Learning Project, there were no moments when the questions I sought to understand and answer were not, to me, the most important ones I could ask as a librarian: How do adults learn in libraries? How do they make sense out of their tasks? How do adult learners become different because of what they do in libraries? And perhaps the most important question of these important questions: How do librarians help? How do they reinvent themselves in order to make differences in the lives they touch? And what is the nature of that touch?

These questions are still sources of delight, though I answered most of them for myself and have now come to think of other things. What I saw and knew then, however, altered permanently my vision of learning in this society, especially my view of that extraordinary instrumentality that is the librarian's touch.

I am still an inquirer devoted to understanding informing acts in individual lives, especially as these occur in cultural institutions. Everything I know causes me to see information as the formative continuity of adult life—the definitive stream that flows through us as we live and work—and to see the library as a cultural institution where thinking and knowing through information and informing acts occur as in no other human settings. As a scholar and a learner my task is to make these acts and their importance clear.

David Carr is Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Our attention to the Adult Independent Learning Project should begin by asking several things of ourselves. What messages did that particular adventure in library innovation inscribe on our knowing, on the history of our work, and on our thinking about what we do? And what is the meaning of adult learning in libraries? Or better, to return to my earlier question, perhaps unanswerable forever: What is the nature of touch between the librarian and the learner in the library? What is the meaning of our attention to this topic that seems at times to be a moribund if not lost cause?

Informing Acts in Libraries

Information is a formative part of any adult life in motion, yet it is invisible. And so, without form, it is ineffable, yet it is pervasive. And so, without limit, it is continuous in its presence and power. Libraries, museums, and most vividly, zoos, capture information. What librarians, like zookeepers, talk about are the conditions of its captivity. Like the tiger brightly burning behind steel bars, information captured and sustained in the library bears the power to create awe and fear. Remove the bars and the tiger walks the street giving us an opportunity to test this power firsthand. The captivity of information, however, prevents a more devastating chaos. Remove it and we lose telephone systems, texts, hotlines, newspapers, maps, census data, and records of every kind.[1] Were we to turn the old story around, choosing between the chaos of no information and the tiger, perhaps we ought to prefer the tiger.

The informing awe of the tiger on my mind reminds me of a book by Jack Goody called *The Domestication of the Savage Mind,* largely about the effects of list-making on the language and thought of so-called primitive people. Such lists established boundaries, classes, patterns, while changing "not only the world out there but also the psyche in here."[2] The primitive origins of librarians—and all intellect—lie in the list: keeping track, observing and capturing, organizing the wildness, naming the new, playing with new combinations of those names. Keeping the list is an essentially literate, informing, task that marks the change to a culture that can document itself. To live without the list is to drift alone in a world of floating, disconnected objects. Goody says that the list

> is a tool, an amplifier, a facilitating device, of extreme importance. It encourages reflection upon and the organisation of information....It not only permits the reclassification of information by those who can write, and legitimises such reformulations for those who can read, but it also changes the nature of the representation of the world (cognitive processes) for those who cannot do so.[3]

The power of the library is the power of the list. It is the purpose of the library to sustain the list, to expand and alter the list, and to offer it for use. But this purpose—serving the list—is not necessarily identical to the purpose or power of the librarian. It is uncertain that the librarian is merely the instrument of the list, nor is it certain that the librarian is the instrument of the institution. Though the institution may frame and limit the librarian's tasks, the librarian is not identical with the library. It is more certain that the librarian is the instrument of the learner, and that the librarian's great purpose is to affirm an identity or stance or even a distance in relation to or apart from the list in order to be nearer to learners and their thinking.

Librarians act to mediate information between lives, one of which is their own, and these actions have to do with understanding the list and what it is good for; but all of these informing acts are no better than our vision of the human beings who need what the list captures. Consider Dorothy Lee's description of Margaret Mead's presentation of the Arapesh of New Guinea.

> [Mead] describes how, even when a man was walking alone through the jungle, he was in a sense carrying his society with him, so that what he saw along the way was not a vine, a piece of wood, but rather a vine to be picked for Y's roof, a plank for R's house. And the walk he was taking most probably had reference to a social framework.[4]

Most walks that librarians take, in and out of the jungle, also have reference to a social framework or a system of needs. For the librarian and the learner, every step may be seen as an informing act, committed for the sake of one life, continuing the step before and anticipating the step that follows. But it is the step—and not the list—that leads to patterns and meanings in the journey and the life, because it is the step that moves us on.

Every learning passage occurs within a frame, and the Independent Learning Project altered that frame deeply. The word *frame* is used here as Erving Goffman does, to mean an organizing principle that governs events and the subjective involvements of human beings in those events.[5] The meaning is that these acts—helping a learner over time, intervening thoughtfully to make a difference in the learner, attending to the contexts of information use, thinking about information in relation to the dimensions of a specific life—constituted a substantially altered frame for librarianship and the subjective involvements of librarians. By entering the meanings of the adult learner's world and by encountering the learner over time, librarians had to witness the construction of knowing amid the continuities of adult life, one of the most private human acts.

The Independent Learner's World

What world did the helping librarian see? What acts were witnessed? What tasks did these change agents assist? Librarians who participated in the Adult Independent Learning Project witnessed cognitive acts of great complexity and detail from a nearly interior perspective. They witnessed learners engaged in knowledge-making through the instrumentality of their own probing actions, conversations, and dialogues; within the constraints of their previous knowledge and the cultures from which they came; and the life spaces they occupied. The psychologist, George A. Kelly, describes this function as the creation of constructs, of trying notions on for size, of making increasingly "elaborative choices" in order to make a system of knowing more comprehensive and its anticipations more accurate across a broader range of human experiences.[6]

To make it clear that these are not simply instances of getting and using information for some discrete purpose—learning how to put a model ship in a bottle, say—Kelly's words will amplify the focus: "The burden of our assumption is that learning is not a special class of psychological processes; it is synonymous with any and all psychological processes. It is not something that happens to a person on occasion; it is what makes him a person in the first place."[7] Cognitive acts in the library are neither list-making nor list-driven, rather they are complex acts of cultural literacy and self-understanding, acts of language and thought, of evaluation and response, actions of humans remaking themselves and their worlds.

It is fair to say that the helping librarian was carefully admitted to a place within the learner's life space—in Lewin's description, a psychological, social, and physical realm—and so could witness private, self-drawn challenges, attempts to change that involved the articulation of choices and strivings. We now contemplate the librarian standing as a witness to evanescent, invisible actions, acting as an instrument in the evolution of tacit, personal knowledge.[8]

In a book titled *Futures We Are In,* Fred Emery discusses human beings as "ideal seeking systems":

> In a turbulent environment the need for survival [will] press people toward nurturance of others....People will choose those purposes that contribute most to the cultivation and growth of their own competence and the competence of others to better pursue their ends.[9]

While individuals can be ideal seeking systems, Emery writes, they are able to sustain this state of seeking only temporarily. Group life and

association with others are more natural sources of sustenance for the pursuits and adaptations of ideal seeking. In this context, institutions exist as habitats "to support, nurture and protect the efforts of individuals to imagine and aspire."[10] The "ideal seeking system" is not the learner alone, but the librarian as well; alone and together, they find nurturance and support in the institution.

In 1977, librarians were asked to give eyewitness accounts of learners as seeking systems—though not in those words—in the form of positive and negative critical incidents, reporting the learner's problem, the librarian's response, and the meaning of the encounter. Here are two of those reports.

Two Critical Incidents

Critical Incident No. 1

An adult learner had been studying in three areas: Celtic mythology, Irish literature, and dreams in order to build knowledge for a long-term goal of writing a novel. After four months on these projects he came in and said, "You're going to kill me, but I want to change projects. I'm still interested in the others but at present I would like to explore filmmaking in order to write a paper for entry into a film school in San Francisco."

I very positively approved his change of topic and said that was fine since a major part of independent learning is exploratory. Sometimes it takes us a certain amount of probing in a topic before we realize it is not really what we want to learn about. We then put his other projects on the back burner and had an interview for his new project.

The incident was significant because it showed me a person ripe for learning, interested in many subjects, but at a point of indecision. It made me realize that as the advisor I could not make him continue in one course of learning (to complete his novel), but had to be adaptable to the changes (growth) of the learner as he or she discovers new things about the world and self. As I pointed out, it showed me that a major part of independent learning is exploratory.

Critical Incident No. 2

The learner (age 61-70) offered to function as a resource person for me in the area of insurance and beginning investing. His project (on investing) is a high level project as he has considerable prior experience and education in this area. I function primarily as a resource gatherer for him, obtaining materials he specifically requests and identifying

new sources. In conversation, he became aware of my interest in finding out more about insurance and made his offer.

I agreed to ask him any questions I had after or in the course of my reading. He recommended some books and even brought me a few of his own. We briefly discussed the merits of different approaches presented by various authors. In short, I started a mini-learning project as the learner within the context of our relationship.

Although I feel this interaction is significant, I'm not sure it's entirely positive. First, it is outside the established roles and expectations of the program. Second, it addresses and pursues my learning interests on library time (albeit minimally) and could be seen as detracting from or confusing the learning relationship. Obviously, I feel it is positive in effect. It emphasizes the arbitrariness of learner/advisor roles and the advisability of being flexible in assuming both roles at various times. Our relationship is strengthened, both personally and as advisor-learner. More interest was stimulated in the learner for his project as a result of my sharing a similar interest. Although the advisor can't be an expert in the subject matter of a learner's project (most of the time), sharing an appreciation for the topic adds richness to the relationship and probably contributes to ongoing success.

Several patterns emerged in an examination of more than 100^{11} of these incidents.

—Collaboration, reciprocity, empathy, and trust were critical parts of relationships between librarians and learners.
—Bonds emerged between librarians and learners; these relationships had integrity and power; and they continued beyond the issues or content of the learning itself.
—Successful work was based on realistic perceptions of roles, tasks, personal skills, and possible results. Among these awarenesses was this: it is the learner alone who determines the desire and commitment to learn, but it is the librarian who controls the invitation.
—At their best, librarians learned from practice how to design help and reflect change or passage to the learner: librarians learned to give support that nurtured self-discovery. They changed in vision, power, and skill.
—Assistance of this kind, involving the presence of the helper beyond the giving of information is lasting because it touches the conditions and patterns of adult life in order to generate designed change in the learner.
—However important the information given, it is no more important than the quality of the giving.

Further inquiry now, assuming all of the foregoing to need no additional proof, could examine different things, striving especially to see clearly the learner's adaptive acts in the presence of information: how the behavior of the learner integrates new experiences and new data; how the stream of information courses through one life, shaping it, smoothing it, causing trouble here and growth there.

We also need to know how thinking happens in libraries: how mental acts such as decision and pursuit occur; how and why investments are made, and the returns they yield; how these change what Frank Smith refers to as the dynamics of the world in the head.[12] Smith also says that "by writing we find out what we know, what we think"[13] and so it is that attention should now be drawn to language acts in libraries; how the learner documents and describes tasks and problems, discoveries, and distractions; how—through powers of language—the learner goes beyond experience, toward innovation, toward what Jerome Bruner refers to as "context-free elaboration."[14]

Language acts are the essential embodiments of strategy and concept, and the clearest indicators of two critical elements of independent learning: (1) the learner's image of the world, and (2) the economies active in the learner's life space. Language acts are likely to illuminate two other concepts: E.D. Hirsch has described "cultural literacy"—the "canonical knowledge...inherently necessary to a literate democracy,"[15] and Richard C. Anderson has alluded to a level of metaknowledge or "beliefs and knowledge about knowledge."[16] Both of these concepts and the language used by learners to capture them must have plenty to do with how learners generalize, make inferences, weave information into coherent wholes, and so become conscious knowers.

Three other problems, each successively more abstract, are also engaging. Because practice depends on useful behavior, more needs to be known about how learners respond in the presence of unknowns: how they define and develop the skills to pursue and reduce their questions; how they know when a new unknown has emerged and an old one has changed. Qualities and conditions of "ownership" in inquiry need to be explored: how a learner frames a problem as one might frame a house; and then, how the learner inhabits that problem, completes it by investing it with a human presence. These are inquiries into what Polanyi calls "personal knowledge": "passionate participation in the act of knowing."[17] Finally, and most inviting, is the need to understand the learner in the act of shaping and recombining data, reordering and repatterning information, remaking the world at hand in order to permit things to go on.[18]

There are rich, inviting unknowns in the world of the adult independent learner and so in libraries too. These might also be called infinite unknowns, likely to be hidden forever from full view. For example, psychologists describe a phenomenon called "unconscious reading" based on a demonstration that "one part of the mind can know something, while the part that supposedly knows something is going on—awareness—remains oblivious." This leads to the confounding premise that "much consequential mental activity goes on outside awareness."[19] Imagine the invisible actions of a sentient brain in the library capturing knowledge in milliseconds while awareness apparently sleeps.

Were the Adult Independent Learning Project now reborn, its designers would have a far richer array of information about self-direction and learning to consider. Any one or two of these books would have made immense differences to the needs and inquiries of a decade ago. For example, Robert M. Smith is responsible for two recent books: *Learning How to Learn* and *Helping Adults Learn How to Learn.* Novak and Gowin's *Learning How to Learn* addresses the application of research to practice among several populations of learners. Allen Tough has offered a second edition of his seminal work, *The Adult's Learning Projects* and *Intentional Changes: A Fresh Approach to Helping People Change.* Ronald and Beatrice Gross have developed encouraging information and advice in their two works about scholarship outside academe: *Independent Scholarship* and *The Independent Scholar's Handbook.* Finally, Stephen Brookfield's recent volumes, *Adult Learners, Adult Education and the Community* and *Self-Directed Learning: From Theory to Practice* are the best—comprehensive and germane—resources at hand.[20]

Brookfield's essay, "Self-Directed Learning: A Critical Review of Research"[21] suggests the richer, firmer ground for understanding self-directed learning in cultural institutions today. The important insights of recent research tend to disconfirm some typical guiding assumptions or images of the adult independent learner's world.

Despite the connotations and inferences of terminology, the "autonomous," "self-directed," "independent," learner does not work in isolation, at a distance from social settings. Tough's work clearly demonstrated the need and conditions for a helper or guiding association that contributes to learning. Brookfield's own research in the United Kingdom found successful independent learners to be strongly grounded in social contexts involving informed peers and informal learning networks. The social context is not merely a convivial and

facilitative setting for independent learning, but it apparently offers a kind of engagement that is in itself formative and purposeful.

Similarly, conventional belief among adult educators tends to associate successful independent learning with a field-independent cognitive style, believing the learner to be socially independent, analytical, inner-directed, self-identified. In contrast, the field-dependent learner is characterized as wanting more structure and guidance. However, Brookfield reports:

> Successful self-directed learners exhibit characteristics close to those of the field-dependent learning style in a number of significant ways. The learning activities of successful self-directed learners are placed within a social context, and other people are cited as the most important learning resource. Peers and fellow learners provide information, serve as skill models, and act as reinforcers of learning and as counselors at times of crisis. Successful self-directed learners appear to be highly aware of context in the sense that they place their learning within a social setting in which the advice, information, and skill modeling provided by other learners are crucial conditions for successful learning.[22]

Those who remember the Adult Independent Learning Project may cherish the notion that successful library learning depends on the learner arriving at a strong, deliberate sense of purpose characterized by planning and goal-direction. In practice, helping-librarians were devoted to keeping to a design and reducing ambiguities. In contrast, Brookfield cautions that "highly regulated control" over self-directed activities may be overemphasized and premature. He describes an alternate model where exploration alone is the aim, and no intended goal is clear. It is a model that tolerates tentative ends and accepts insights nurtured through dialogue. It assumes that only as a usable information construct emerges can a learner set fitting, intrinsic goals. An idea mentioned by Mezirow may be usefully applied here: while librarianship may focus on inductive and deductive forms of knowing, perhaps the more important form is *abductive* knowing—cognitive acts that suggest something that *might* be.[23]

Brookfield writes: "As the mode of learning characteristic of adults...realizing their adulthood, self-directed learning is concerned much more with an internal change of consciousness than with the external management of instructional events."[24] The task of the helper may have to do with coming to see the inquirer's search for knowledge in its personal contextual and cultural frames—perhaps to unframe and transpose these contexts for the integration of entirely new forms of

knowing. Finally, it is among the multiple dimensions of adult learning acts—dimensions that go beyond managing information and carrying things out—that the transformation of private adult worlds occurs.

Documenting Adult Learning Initiatives

This view is needed still in librarianship: an interior view of the inquiry process in the library including the involvement of helping agents, the exploration of experiences that occur both in and outside the library, and the integration of library learning with the multiple continuities of adult life. Librarianship—the collective acts of librarians in libraries that make differences in the lives of learners—is the vantage from which this documentation will be best created. Everyday librarianship, however, appears not to be a knowledge-producing profession.

Two faces should be identified in this now-uncaptured documentation: the learner mirrored in the inquiry itself and the librarian mirrored in the learner's initiatives. What sort of thinking and knowing happens in library encounters? *What change is needed?* and *How can I assist?* are among the most complex questions in professional work, not simply because they may involve hard risks, difficult judgments, and articulate skills, but because, from moment to moment, the best answers we have are likely to change even as we utter them.

It is difficult to envision a time when librarianship or education (or medicine or law) will ever have enough knowledge about its interior processes. And every hidden interior needs an inquirer's eye: the relationships between librarians and those they help, the logics and processes of responding to an inquiry, and the organizational adaptations needed to initiate and sustain an agency for adult learning in the cultural institution.

One wise investment might be to purchase a pencil and a journal for every librarian. A second investment might be to clear private time for each librarian each day to keep track of the disappearing moments of exaltation or despair experienced during encounters with learners and colleagues. Such personal documentation should be part of the job description—not simply because it might assist in the development of profiles and records, but because such writing is a needed form of thought and reflection. It mirrors professional growth, the agent becoming competent. Every one of us needs to know how that happens, but it is especially urgent that those who assist adults do this for two reasons. First, we may never otherwise know interior dimensions of adult learning in the library. Second, in an encapsulating, technology-ridden, routine-dominated, and underimagined profession, we cannot

otherwise keep adults and their need for information on our minds.

That mindfulness, of course, was in the broadest sense the principal richness of the Adult Independent Learning Project and its impact on some of the economies of librarianship. Thinking about extended, serious, devoted assistance to adult learners was part of the librarian's task, conducted in association with other librarians, among whom conversations about the challenges of assistance regularly occurred. The importance of this simple fact cannot be overemphasized. Today it is not possible to lead a fully professional life as a librarian without the development of a theory of practice and purpose, and the beginning of that theory is intensely focused, supported professional talk. Of course this is the inspiration of the project as well: it sought to capture a vision of what libraries can do if librarians are free to think and act for the sake of adult learners and their learning.

Here are four important meanings of the Adult Independent Learning Project.

1. The project embodied the library as both an idea and a locus for inquiry, literacy, and documentation. The project *evoked* these acts as much as it consciously developed them. As we read the concrete, survey-dominated reports of these innovations,[25] it is important to keep the library as an idea in mind.
2. It is unfortunate that the phrase "learners advisory service" dominates the documentation because the word *service* belies the true offering of the library in this innovation, where the librarian and the learner create a relationship and design a process. This involves unique acts of mutuality and communication initiated by an invitation to collaborate, in itself a precious rarity, going far beyond the notion of service. Whatever they do at other times in their lives, librarians in this work do not simply serve but strive to create useful collaborations in the intellectual life of their communities.
3. Though the immediate attention of any one librarian may have been given to the individual learner or a series of learners, it can be assumed that a *community* of learners gained definition and presence in the imagination of librarians. That is, in these settings, one effect of the initiative must have been to redefine information as a continuity flowing through the lives that compose the community of adults even though that community may have presented itself one life at a time. And, because human lives are interdependent and the smallest acts within one life resonate invisibly among nameless others, we might assume that this is a community without detectable limits.

4. Finally, all such redefinitions—of information, literacy, inquiry, documentation, community—demand professional and personal adaptations, and that is another outcome of the project: it caused librarians to change, to become theorists of their own practice. Moreover, the project itself can be seen as an initiative that caused libraries to change the traditional boundaries and definitions of librarianship in their own communities. The helper's work extended beyond the briefly informing encounter to touch the proceses of information use—and witness the consequences of informed actions. The project touched among other things the identities of individuals and their institutions, and so turned them more fully into public agents in public cultural spaces. This was a public investment in nurturance, a recognition of the need to empower librarians if librarians are to empower learners. It is clear, isn't it, that learners must learn from learners?

Learning in the Public Space

The philosopher of education, Maxine Greene, describes an "authentic public space...[as one] that might give rise to a significant common world." Citing Richard Sennett and Hannah Arendt, Greene points to "the deadness and emptiness in the public domain" and an already withdrawn public "building barricades around their private spaces rather than engaging in...expanding associated relationships."[26]

> If this is the case, it is exacerbated by the distance from the centers of power people experience in these times, by their alienation from the context-free, technical language presently in use. Ordinarily, contextual language—the language of face-to-face interchange—now sounds ineffectual against the clicking of simulation games and the whirring of computerized projections. Many persons find themselves in a strange, almost unrecognizable new world. This has intensified the alien quality, the perceived impersonality of what lies outside the private realm. It has drained ordinary meanings from the public domain.[27]

And so we have an increasingly inarticulate public, Greene says, unlike the shipworkers in Gdansk or the marchers we remember in Selma, Alabama twenty-some years ago. (Ten years were needed for the private sorrows of the Vietnam Conflict to take the form of notes and objects left in gentle memory at the foot of the memorial to those lost soldiers.) Greene writes:

> There *is* no space where human beings, speaking and acting in their plurality, can appear before one another and realize the power they have simply in being together. And there surely is no such space in most of the schools. Nor is there the freedom experienced when young persons discover that they have the capacity to reach out and attain feelings, thoughts, and ways of being, hitherto unimagined—and even, perhaps, ways of acting on what they believe to be deficient, ways of transcending and going beyond.[28]

Greene goes on to cite the work of Hannah Arendt, describing the public space as an environment where people "come together being free to tell their stories, to speak from their own locations in the world." Such knowing and such speaking—out of the lifespace, to use Lewin's term again—are ways to ground human understanding in the public space. It is a space where human beings can arrive at "modes of structuring, modes of interpreting their lived and shared reality."[29]

The idea of the public library as an agency for the learning of independent adults realizes an informing public space where thought, reflection, and learning follow from the articulate contexts of individual adult lives. Every encounter has its story; every story, because it is disclosed to another human being in dialogue—and because it leads into the future—has binding and enduring consequences for its author. Because these encounters involve sustained, delicate acts of language, they are not casual. Because they lead to action they involve what Martin Buber refers to as "the currents of universal reciprocity," a deep contrast to deadness, emptiness, distance, and withdrawal. Such encounters also lead to passage and renewal, and they are often difficult and so a warning is needed.

Public spaces for inquiry and growth cannot be created without the reality of concomitant and intense emergencies for which most librarians are not well-prepared. The support of learners is not simply support for self-designed projects, smooth-flowing passages toward goals, or exhilarating self-renewals. These are possible and perhaps longed for. But most passages require an opening of perception and feeling to difficulty and fear, to risk and introspection. This is a mutual opening; both learner and librarian feel it and feel challenged by it. In a recent definition of adult education, Brookfield alludes to the potential for "anxiety, pain, self-doubt, and ambiguity" in such work.[30] But I must add that these are balanced by the potential for altruism, invitation, and joy, and these too are mutually felt.

Self-esteem was one of the many gifts bestowed by the attention of the agent to the learner. Though it may be comforting to focus helping

acts on tools, techniques, and resources, true empowerment and self-transformation for the learner will follow best from a series of thoughtful, critical, ultimately mutual transactions, one development of which is the investment and vulnerability of the librarian. That is to say unless the librarian learns by taking risks in the public space no one can learn there.

Literacy in the Public Space

Libraries tend to define themselves in reaction to the agendas of others, as though libraries as cultural institutions have no generic agendas of their own, no purposeful places in national mental life, no inherent powers to transmit to American communities, no independent messages for learners. In the recent discourse surrounding *A Nation at Risk* there are too few challenges to its shallow assumptions and narrow recommendations. As a consequence the document fulfills Everett Reimer's prescient but dismal 1971 declaration that "School has become the universal church of a technological society."[31] It requires only one thumb to count the uses of the word *information* in the report's recommendations, and the digits of one hand to count references to libraries and museums.

It is a bitter irony that even as the image of a learning society is endorsed and our distance from it is decried, those American institutions designed for self-transformation throughout the lifespan remain invisible and unsung. Though it is clear that our most important passages as learners are charted on maps we discover outside schools, the original contributions of the library to the passage are the least known. That is why our nation is at risk, not because its schools have not pummeled our children enough.

It is incumbent upon librarianship to struggle against the narrow view that results in the confounding of learning and schooling. When the dense fusillades surrounding *A Nation at Risk* have become still, librarians might wisely turn to two other public documents, *Books in Our Future*[32] and *Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading*,[33] in order to begin the process of reinventing the profession in the public space. In a society with an illiterate or significantly dysfunctional population that exceeds 60 million,[34] at least one element of the library's assistance to learners should be profoundly, undebatably clear.

Librarians are not servants of schooling but agents whose powers can transform the private worlds of learners. Librarians offer access to a coherent world or to a power that can order incoherence through

language. Consider the three rich metaphors for literacy offered by Sylvia Scribner. Two of these may not surprise us. The first, "literacy as adaptation," captures a proficiency needed for survival. The second, "literacy as power," captures an instrumentality useful for advancement. The third metaphor is most impressive because it goes well beyond adaptation and success to capture a richness that implies both articulation of and possession by a condition of knowledge so private that Scribner calls it "literacy as a state of grace." "The literate individual's life derives its meaning and significance from intellectual, aesthetic, and spiritual participation in the accumulated creations and knowledge of humankind, made available through the printed word."[35]

To transcend boundaries of personal power and to assist learners to transcend such boundaries for themselves is not distant from the meaning of help in the library. Nor is it unlike the sense of power evoked by Maxine Greene. "Once provoked," she writes, "the mind or the imagination keeps inclining itself, addressing itself to what is not yet." And further: "Desire is evoked by the realization of what is not yet, expressed in the yearning toward possibility....There are boundaries, yes, edges, frames; but they are there to be transcended. And to transcend, each one himself or herself and at once along with others, is to transform the petrified world."[36]

The Librarian's Gaze

The great risk is that librarians may never fully imagine the infinite ways of knowing and assisting learners that lay now unrealized in their hands. We will never find a more important form of life-transforming help than the simplest communicative acts between librarians and learners in libraries. These are the initiatives that matter the most, the messages that must be most inviting. When we attempt to understand the meanings of adult independent learning in libraries, apart from counting and classifying the skills or changes that emerge through this agency, we must recognize that the moments of mutual gaze between learner and librarian are the definitive, shaping instants of this experience.

Assistance to independent learners in libraries means that the librarian's gaze shifts—not to "information," nor to "adult learning," nor to "independent scholarship." The change in gaze is conceptual, to a different way of knowing or probing. It is a fundamental redefinition of the frame. Bateson defined frame broadly, as kinds of messages exchanged, notions of *play* between participants, basic premises of

encounters.[37] By changing the frame, the librarian's gaze shifts to individual human lives and contexts, fields where information is encountered and used, to themes and needs flowing through individual experience. It is a form of adventure: crossing a personal boundary and exploring the unknowns there especially the possible uses of information to make a difference in one life.

This shift implies a difference in what librarians and the library do for learners. Jerome Bruner says that the important events of mental life imply going beyond the information given—to reorganize it and use it insightfully.[38] What we are talking about is going beyond the giving of information—to evaluate and sort it, to help in its integration with existing information, to communicate about it, and so to create better conditions for individual knowing. Such a difference means that the librarian moves from witness to participant, from distance to proximity, from information to communication and beyond, to responsibility, identification, and instrumentality. Certainly proximity to the learner must mean that the librarian must be prepared to give up the barriers and masks that may have been too useful for too long.

Such changes in relationship mean trying to understand how learners are empowered in libraries, and this means answering some difficult questions: What is usable help? How are inquiries most usefully documented? What structures are needed to enhance settings of individual choice? These are all questions answerable through practice—certainly they have already been answered in practice countless times. So it may not be new knowledge that we need but new understanding of the values and dimensions of the relationships between learners and librarians and the roots of mastery in this profession. We first may need to understand the value of a generous mentor.

There are vast and untouched qualitative dimensions in librarianship. They are present in the lives of each of us who understands that some lives need informed help in order to work better, and that such help has meaning for both the giver and the recipient of the gift. These dimensions are present in each of us who remembers when *our* help changed the experience of another human being. But this qualitative power goes untouched by library school curricula, unrewarded by library managers, and unaddressed by much of the profession itself with the possible exception of children's librarianship. How will the profession respond to the following question: Why are your best, most nurturant, most generous, most adult, most giving acts so carefully hidden?

To learn and change involves conditions of risk and vulnerability, support, and trust. This last condition, trust, is best because it makes risk, vulnerability, and support possible. One form of trust has to do

with maintaining the order of things, which librarians do very well. Another has to do with technical competence and role, and librarians have those things under control. But the third form of trust is that having to do with fiduciary responsibilities: that partners in transactions will meet their duties, placing the needs and interests of others before their own.[39] How librarians define and act on this form of trust must become the topic of professional and institutional dialogues—a permanent, challenging discourse for the field.

There are only two responses to this challenge that matter. The first, in view of the energies, time, expectations, and responsibilities of helping adult learners, is understandable: "I am afraid." The second response—and these are Jules Henry's words—is founded in knowing our best strength: "I may be stronger than I think." One form of knowledge that came from the experiment of a decade ago is that libraries and librarians—in their capacity to know, help, and give—are far stronger than they think.

References

1. "Imagine Tomorrow Without Information Services." *Bulletin of the ASIS* 6(Oct. 1979):29.

2. Goody, Jack. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977, p. 108.

3. Ibid., pp. 109-10.

4. Lee, Dorothy. *Valuing the Self: What We Can Learn from Other Cultures.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976, pp. 8-9.

5. Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

6. Kelly, George. *A Theory of Personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1963.

7. Ibid., p. 75.

8. Neehall, Joan, and Tough, Allen. "Fostering Intentional Changes Among Adults." *Library Trends* 31(Spring 1983):543-53; and Spear, George E., and Mocker, Donald W. "The Organizing Circumstance: Environmental Determinants in Self-Directed Learning." *Adult Education Quarterly* 35(Fall 1984):1-10.

9. Emery, Frederick E. *Futures We Are In.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977, pp. 74-75.

10. Ibid., p. 80.

11. Carr, David W. "The Agent and the Learner: A Study of Critical Incidents and Contexts in Assisted Adult Library Learning." Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1979.

12. Smith, Frank. *Writing and the Writer.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

13. Ibid., p. 33.

14. Bruner, Jerome. "Language as an Instrument of Thought." In *Problems in Language and Learning,* edited by Alan Davies, pp. 61-88. London: Heinemann, 1975.

15. Hirsch, E.D. "Cultural Literacy." *The American Scholar* 52(Spring 1983):165.

16. Anderson, Richard C. "Some Reflections on the Acquisition of Knowledge." *Educational Researcher* 13(Nov. 1984):9.

17. Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 17.

18. Goodman, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking.* Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1978.

19. Goleman, Daniel. "Insights into Self-Deception." *New York Times Magazine* (12 May 1985):39-40.

20. Smith, Robert M. *Learning How to Learn.* New York: Cambridge Book Co., 1982; _____. "Helping Adults Learn How to Learn." *New Directions for Continuing Education,* no. 19, Sept. 1983; Novak, Joseph D., and Gowin, D. Bob. *Learning How to Learn.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984; Tough, Allen M. *The Adult's Learning Projects: A Fresh Approach to Theory and Practice in Adult Learning,* 2d ed. San Diego, Calif.: Learning Concepts, 1979; _____. *Intentional Changes.* Chicago: Follett, 1982; Gross, Ronald. *The Independent Scholar's Handbook.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1982; Gross, Ronald, and Gross, Beatrice. *Independent Scholarship: Promise, Problems and Prospects.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983; Brookfield, Stephen. *Adult Learners, Adult Education and the Community.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1984; and _____. *Self-Directed Learning: From Theory to Practice* (New Directions for Continuing Education Series, no. 25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

21. Brookfield, Stephen. "Self-Directed Learning: A Critical Review of Research." In *Self-Directed Learning,* pp. 5-16.

22. Ibid., p. 9.

23. Mezirow, Jack. "A Critical Theory of Self-Directed Learning." In *Self-Directed Learning,* pp. 17-30.

24. Brookfield, "Self-Directed Learning," p. 15.

25. Mavor, Anne S., et al. *The Role of the Public Libraries in Adult Independent Learning: Final Report; pt. I, pt. II.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976; Thresher, Jacquelyn, *Final Report of the Adult Independent Learner Project.* Woodbridge, N.J.: Free Public Library of Woodbridge, 1977.

26. Greene, Maxine. "Public Education and the Public Space." *Educational Researcher* 11(June/July 1982):4-6.

27. Ibid., p. 5.

28. Ibid., p. 6.

29. Ibid., p. 7.

30. Brookfield, Stephen. "A Critical Definition of Adult Education." *Adult Education Quarterly* 36(Fall 1985):45.

31. Reimer, Everett. *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971.

32. Joint Committee on the Library of Congress of the United States. *Books in Our Future* (report of a study conducted under the auspices of the Center for The Book). Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1984.

33. National Academy of Education, Commission on Reading. *Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, 1985.

34. Hunter, Carman St. John, and Harman, David. *Adult Illiteracy in the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985; and Kozol, Jonathan. *Illiterate America.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1985.

35. Scribner, Sylvia. "Literacy in Three Metaphors." *American Journal of Education* 93(Nov. 1984):14.

36. Greene, Maxine. "The Art of Being Present: Education for Aesthetic Encounters." *Journal of Education (Boston)* 166(July 1984): 134.

37. Bateson, Gregory. "A Theory of Play and Fantasy." In *Steps to an Ecology of Mind,* pp. 177-93. New York: Ballantine Books, 1972.

38. Bruner, Jerome S. "Going Beyond the Information Given." In *Beyond the Information Given: Studies in the Psychology of Knowing*, edited by Jeremey M. Anglin, pp. 218-38. New York: W.W. Norton, 1973.

39. Barber, Bernard. *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1983.

40. Henry, Jules. *Jules Henry on Education*. New York: Vintage, 1972, p. 24.

Partial List of Library Trends Issues in Print*

				Title	*Editor*	*Date*
V.	11	N.	1	Library Boards	J. Archer Eggen	July 1962
	11		2	Bibliotherapy	Ruth M. Tews	Oct. 1962
	11		3	Law Libraries	Bernita J. Davies	Jan. 1963
	11		4	Financial Administration of Libraries	Ralph H. Parker Paxton P. Price	April 1963
V.	12	N.	1	Public Library Service to Children	Winifred C. Ladley	July 1963
	12		2	Education for Librarianship Abroad in Selected Countries	Harold Lancour J. Clement Harrison	Oct. 1963
	12		3	Current Trends in Reference Services	Margaret Knox Goggin	Jan. 1964
	12		4	European University Libraries: Current Status and Developments	Robert Vosper	April 1964
V.	13	N.	1	Research Methods in Librarianship	Guy Garrison	July 1964
	13		2	State and Local History in Libraries	Clyde Walton	Oct. 1964
	13		3	Regional Public Library Systems	Hannis S. Smith	Jan. 1965
	13		4	Library Furniture and Furnishings	Frazer G. Poole	April 1965
V.	14	N.	1	Metropolitan Public Library Problems Around the World	H.C. Campbell	July 1965
	14		2	Junior College Libraries	Charles L. Trinkner	Oct. 1965
	14		3	Library Service to Industry	Katharine G. Harris Eugene B. Jackson	Jan. 1966
	14		4	Current Trends in Branch Libraries	Andrew Geddes	April 1966
V.	15	N.	1	Government Publications	Thomas S. Shaw	July 1966
	15		2	Collection Development in University Libraries	Jerrold Orne	Oct. 1966
†	15		3	Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends. Part 1	Robert B. Downs Frances B. Jenkins	Jan. 1967
†	15		4	Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends. Part 2	Robert B. Downs Frances B. Jenkins	April 1967
V.	16	N.	1	Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging	Esther J. Piercy Robert L. Talmadge	July 1967
	16		2	Library Uses of the New Media of Communication	C. Walter Stone	Oct. 1967
	16		3	Abstracting Services	Foster E. Mohrhardt	Jan. 1968
	16		4	School Library Services and Administration at the School District Level	Sara K. Srygley	April 1968
V.	17	N.	1	Group Services in Public Libraries	Grace T. Stevenson	July 1968
	17		2	Young Adult Service in the Public Library	Audrey Biel	Oct. 1968
	17		3	Development in National Documentation and Information Services	H.C. Campbell	Jan. 1969
	17		4	The Changing Nature of the School Library	Mae Graham	April 1969
V.	18	N.	1	Trends in College Librarianship	H. Vail Deale	July 1969
	18		2	University Library Buildings	David C. Weber	Oct. 1969
	18		3	Problems of Acquisition for Research Libraries	Rolland E. Stevens	Jan. 1970
	18		4	Issues and Problems in Designing a National Program of Library Automation	Henry J. Dubester	April 1970
V.	19	N.	1	Intellectual Freedom	Everett T. Moore	July 1970
	19		2	State and Federal Legislation for Libraries	Alex Ladenson	Oct. 1970
	19		3	Book Storage	Mary B. Cassata	Jan. 1971
	19		4	New Dimensions in Educational Technology for Multi-Media Centers	Philip Lewis	April 1971
V.	20	N.	1	Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries	Elizabeth W. Stone	July 1971
	20		2	Library Programs and Services to the Disadvantaged	Helen H. Lyman	Oct. 1971
	20		3	The Influence of American Librarianship Abroad	Cecil K. Byrd	Jan. 1972
	20		4	Current Trends in Urban Main Libraries	Larry Earl Bone	April 1972
V.	21	N.	1	Trends in Archival and Reference Collections of Recorded Sound	Gordon Stevenson	July 1972
	21		2	Standards for Libraries	Felix E. Hirsch	Oct. 1972
	21		3	Library Services to the Aging	Eleanor Phinney	Jan. 1973
	21		4	Systems Design and Analysis for Libraries	F. Wilfrid Lancaster	April 1973
V.	22	N.	1	Analyses of Bibliographies	H.R. Simon	July 1973
	22		2	Research in the Fields of Reading and Communication	Alice Lohrer	Oct. 1973
	22		3	Evaluation of Library Services	Sarah Reed	Jan. 1974
	22		4	Science Materials for Children and Young People	George S. Bonn	April 1974

Partial List of Library Trends Issues in Print*

			Title	Editor	Date
V. 23	N. 1		Health Sciences Libraries	Joan Titley Adams	July 1974
23		2	Library Services in Metropolitan Areas	William S. Budington	Oct. 1974
23		3	Music and Fine Arts in the General Library	Guy A. Marco Wolfgang M. Freitag	Jan. 1975
23		4	Resource Allocation in Library Management	H. William Axford	April 1975
V. 24	N. 1		Federal Aid to Libraries	Genevieve M. Casey	July 1975
24		2	Library Cooperation	Pearce S. Grove	Oct. 1975
24		3	Community Analysis and Libraries	Larry Earl Bone	Jan. 1976
24		4	Commercial Library Supply Houses	Harold Roth	April 1976
V. † 25	N. 1		American Library History: 1876-1976	Howard W. Winger	July 1976
25		2	Employee Organizations and Collective Bargaining in Libraries	Margaret A. Chaplan	Oct. 1976
25		3	Trends in Bibliographic Control: International Issues	Mary Ellen Soper Benjamin F. Page	Jan. 1977
25		4	Trends in the Scholarly Use of Library Resources	D.W. Krummel	April 1977
V. 26	N. 1		Library Services to Correctional Facilities	Jane Pool	Sum. 1977
26		2	Trends in the Governance of Libraries	F. William Summers	Fall 1977
26		3	Institution Libraries	Harris C. McClaskey	Win. 1978
26		4	Publishing in the Third World	Philip G. Altbach Keith Smith	Sprg. 1978
V. 27	N. 1		Films in Public Libraries		Sum. 1978
27		2	State Library Development Agencies	John A. McCrossan	Fall 1978
27		3	Libraries and Society	Phyllis Dain Margaret F. Stieg	Win. 1979
27		4	Study and Collecting of Historical Children's Books	Selma K. Richardson	Sprg. 1979
V. 28	N. 1		Economics of Academic Libraries	Allen Kent Jacob Cohen K. Leon Montgomery	Sum. 1979
28		2	Emerging Patterns of Community Service	Margaret Monroe Kathleen M. Heim	Fall 1979
28		3	Library Consultants	Ellsworth E. Mason	Win. 1980
28		4	Current Trends in Rural Public Library Service	John M. Houlahan	Sprg. 1980
V. 29	N. 1		Current Library Use Instruction	A.P. Marshall	Sum. 1980
29		2	Library Services to Ethnocultural Minorities	Leonard Wertheimer	Fall 1980
29		3	Map Librarianship and Map Collections	Mary Lynette Larsgaard	Win. 1981
29		4	Public Lending Right	Perry D. Morrison	Sprg. 1981
V. 30	N. 1		Bibliometrics	William Gray Potter	Sum. 1981
30		2	Conservation of Library Materials	Gerald Lundeen	Fall 1981
30		3	Data Libraries for the Social Sciences	Kathleen M. Heim	Win. 1982
30		4	Mental Health Information: Libraries and Services to the Patient	Phyllis Rubinton	Sprg. 1982
V. 31	N. 1		Standards for Library and Information Services	Terry L. Weech	Sum. 1982
31		2	Technical Standards for Library and Information Science	James E. Rush	Fall 1982
31		3	Current Trends in Reference Services	Bernard Vavrek	Win. 1983
31		4	Adult Learners, Learning and Public Libraries	Elizabeth J. Burge	Sprg. 1983
V. 32	N. 1		Genealogy and Libraries	Diane Foxhill Carothers	Sum. 1983
32		2	Current Problems in Copyright	Walter Allen Jerome K. Miller	Fall 1983
32		3	Atypical Careers and Innovative Services in Library and Information Science	Walter C. Allen Laurence W.S. Auld	Win. 1984
32		4	Research in Librarianship	Mary Jo Lynch	Sprg. 1984
V. 33	N. 1		Protecting the Library	Alan Jay Lincoln	Sum. 1984
33		2	The Quality of Trade Book Publishing in the 1980s	Walter C. Allen Eleanor Blum Ann Heidbreder Eastman	Fall 1984
33		3	Collection Evaluation	Elizabeth Futas Sheila S. Intner	Win. 1985
33		4	Community/Junior College Libraries	Marilyn Lary	Sprg. 1985
V. 34	N. 1		Media Collections and Services in Academic Libraries	Phyllis G. Ahlsted Paul Graham	Sum. 1985
34		2	Women and Leadership in the Library Profession	Rosemary R. DuMont	Fall 1985
34		3	History of Library and Information Science Education	Donald G. Davis, Jr. Phyllis Dain	Win. 1986
34		4	Current and Future Trends in Library and Information Science Education	George Bobinski	Sprg. 1986
V. 35	N. 1		Privacy, Secrecy and National Information Policy	Robert Burger	Sum. 1986
35		2	Adult Education, Literacy, and Libraries	Fall 1986	

A complete list of back issues is available from *Library Trends*, Publications Office, University of Illinois, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, IL 61820-6291.

†Also available in clothbound editions.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Procedures for Proposing & Guest Editing an Issue of *Library Trends*

Scope

Library Trends focuses on library and information science topics of interest primarily to practicing librarians and information scientists and secondarily to educators and students. The style and tone of this quarterly are formal rather than journalistic or popular. *Library Trends* issues review the literature, summarize current practice and thinking, and evaluate the directions practice is taking. Papers must represent original work, published for the first time in *Library Trends*. Extensive updates of previously published studies are acceptable, but revisions or adaptations of published work are not sought.

Processes of Proposing and Publishing

An issue editor proposes the theme and scope of a new issue, draws up a list of prospective authors and articles, and provides short annotations of the articles' scope or else gives a statement of the philosophy guiding the issue's development. The issue prospectus is examined by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science (GSLIS) Publications Committee and requests for clarification or modification may be made before the prospectus is approved.

Once the prospectus is approved by the GSLIS Publications Committee, the issue will be scheduled for publication and the issue editor begins by inviting authors to write for the issue. The Publications Office will alert the authors to issue deadlines and will send them "Instructions for *Library Trends* Authors." The issue editor also will be sent a copy of the instructions along with "Suggestions for *Library Trends* Issue Editors." The suggestions are culled from our experience in editing and dealing with questions raised by issue editors and authors. Included are the typical stages an issue passes through; responsibilities of the issue editor; the responsibilities of the Publications Office editorial staff; and the typical timing of the writing, editing and production stages. Generally, it takes 1-2 years from proposal to publication.

Soliciting Readers' Ideas

We publish *Library Trends* using theme suggestions of GSLIS Publications Committee members and our readers. We welcome ideas for issues and for writers that our readers would like to hear from. We also encourage readers to volunteer to be issue editors or to suggest others who may be willing. Please write us with your ideas or inquiries: GSLIS Publications Office, University of Illinois, 249 Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Street, Champaign, IL 61820 or call: James Dowling (Managing Editor) at 217/333-1359 or F.W. Lancaster (Editor) at 217/333-3280.

Library Trends

Forthcoming numbers are as follows:

Winter 1987, *Current Trends in Public Library Services for Children*. Editor: Ann Carlson Weeks, Executive Director, Association for Library Service to Children, Division of the American Library Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Spring 1987, *Online Catalogs*. Editor: Karen Markey, Senior Research Scientist, Office of Research, Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), Dublin, Ohio.

Summer 1987, *Recent Trends in Rare Book Librarianship*. Editor: Michele V. Cloonan, Doctoral Candidate, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Fall 1987, *Trends in Library Buildings*. Editor: Anders C. Dahlgren, Consultant for Public Library Construction and Planning, Department of Public Instruction, State of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.